1929

E

218

E10693

Registry Number E10693/14/31

FROM D.O.

No. Comm'd.

Dated

Received in Registry 30 Oct 1946.

Last Paper.

E10692

References.

(Print.)

(How disposed of.)

(Action completed.) GEM 7/11

(Index.) Robs 15/11/46

Next Paper.

E10694

External Affairs Standing Committee.

Transmit copy of letter from I.I.S. Gardner Office of High Commissioner for U.K. Earnscliffe, Ottawa, to Mr Boyd Harrod D.O. enclosing minutes 14, 15, 16 of the External Affairs Committee, discussing the Palestine situation.

(Minutes.)

H.B. 4/11

29470 F.O.P.

With the Compliments of the
Under-Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs.

15 AUG 1946

Office of the High Commissioner
for the United Kingdom,
Earnscliffe,
Ottawa.

E

219

E 10693

8th August, 1946.

My dear Shannon.

With reference to recent Dominions Office telegrams about Palestine, you may be interested to see from the attached minutes (Nos. 14 15 and 16) of the External Affairs Standing Committee the extent to which they have delved into this problem.

The Committee was not authorised to take up this matter in any way or to make any report on the subject to the House but they evidentally thought that it would be a good gesture to hear leading representatives from the two sides.. In fact, in the report to the House, the Committee confined themselves to saying on this subject, "A request to appear before the Committee having been received from the Zionist and Arab Organizations of Canada, your Committee felt that it should grant their request and consequently both Organizations were heard on July 12, 19 and 22."

I am hoping to send you shortly a fuller account of all the activities of the Standing Committee on External Affairs.

Yours ever,

A. D. P. GARNER

G. E. Boyd Shennan, Esq.,
Dominions Office,
London, S.W. 1.

RB.

SESSION 1946

HOUSE OF COMMONS

220

STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 14

FRIDAY, JULY 12, 1946
FRIDAY, JULY 19, 1946

WITNESSES:

Mr. S. J. Zacks, President, Zionist Council of Canada.
Mr. M. Garber, Vice-President, Zionist Council of Canada.
Mr. H. Mowat, Secretary, Canadian Palestine Committee.

OTTAWA
EDMOND CLOUTIER, B.A., L.Ph., C.M.G.,
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
1946

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

FRIDAY, July 12, 1946.

The Standing Committee on External Affairs met this day at 11.30 o'clock a.m. The Chairman, Mr. Bradette, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Benidickson, Bradette, Diefenbaker, Graydon, Hackett, Jackman, Jaenicke, Jaques, Knowles, Leger, Low, MacInnis, Winkler.

The Chairman announced he had received a telegram from the Zionist Organization of Canada, and also a telephone request from the Canadian Palestine Committee requesting permission to have representatives appear before the Committee and make statements as to the present situation in Palestine.

On a motion by Mr. MacInnis, it was resolved that both organizations be heard at the next meeting.

On a motion by Mr. Low, the Committee agreed that if representatives of the Arab Organizations wished to make representations also, they be given the same facilities as the Zionist group.

At this point the Committee met in camera to discuss its next report to the House.

At 12.25 p.m. the Committee adjourned to meet again at 10.30 a.m., Tuesday, July 16.

FRIDAY, July 19, 1946.

The Standing Committee on External Affairs met this day at 10.30 o'clock a.m. The Chairman, Mr. Bradette, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Beaudoin, Benidickson, Bradette, Coldwell, Croll, Fraser, Graydon, Jackman, Jaenicke, Jaques, Kidd, Knowles, Leger, Low, MacInnis, MacLean, Mutch, Sinclair (*Ontario*), Winkler.

In attendance: Messrs. S. J. Zacks, President United Zionist Council of Canada; M. Garber, Vice-President United Zionist Council of Canada; H. Mowat, Secretary Canadian Palestine Committee; J. Jacobson, Halifax; N. Levitsky, Montreal; H. Freedman, K.C., Edmonton; M. Gelber, Toronto, L. Freiman, Ottawa; Mr. and Mrs. Batstone, Toronto, and Mrs. Raginsky, President, Hadassah, Montreal.

The delegation in attendance to present the Zionist views on the Palestine situation were introduced by Mr. Croll who also gave a short address on the question.

Mr. Zacks read a brief on behalf of the Canadian Zionist Council.

Mr. Mowat read a brief of the Canadian Palestine Friendship Committee, supplemented by extemporaneous remarks.

Mr. Garber gave a short address.

The witnesses were questioned by members of the Committee and the time for adjournment having been reached, it was decided,—

On the motion of Mr. Leger to resume examination of witnesses at the next meeting of committee to be held on Monday July 22, 1946, at 10.30 a.m.

On motion of Mr. Low the meeting adjourned at 1.15 p.m.

F. J. CORCORAN,
Clerk of Committee.

68447—1½

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

July 12, 1946.

The Standing Committee on External Affairs met this day at 11.30 o'clock a.m. The Chairman, Mr. J. A. Bradette, presided.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we have a quorum and I shall call the meeting to order. This morning we shall likely spend most of our time formulating our report, but before we proceed to that I wish to get the feeling of the committee on one matter. On July 10 I received the following telegram:—

Montreal, Que., July 10, 1946.

Joseph Arthur BRADETTE, M.P.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa.

In the light of the present situation in Palestine and of the interest of the Canadian public in developments in that country over which Great Britain holds a mandate endorsed by Canada we respectfully request the External Affairs Committee of the House of Commons to give the representatives of the Zionist Organization of Canada an opportunity to appear before the committee sometime next week to discuss with them the issues involved. Will telephone you to-morrow to ascertain decision.

SAMUEL J. ZACKS.
President, Zionist Organization of Canada, 527 Sherbrooke St. West.

Yesterday I had a visit from Mr. Herbert A. Mowat who, I believe, is president of the Canadian Palestine Committee and who also would like to appear at the same time Mr. Zacks appears. I shall leave the decision to members of the committee. Discussion is welcome on the point.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Is there any reason why we should not hear them? It is a subject that is very much to the fore at present and it is of interest everywhere in the world.

Mr. LEGER: Mr. Chairman, we have had a reference from the House to examine External Affairs estimates and I believe we have reached the end of our work. Considering the telegramme you have read to us I do not see what good could result from our taking any action on it. It is a situation that Great Britain is taking care of, and I cannot see what we can do to remedy the situation. I think we should leave that matter to the nation which is looking after it.

Mr. LOW: There is no reason why we should not grant this privilege to the Zionist organization. In fact, I feel that the committee might glean a good deal of information by doing so and obtain a better understanding of the whole situation. I do think, however, Mr. Chairman, that as there are two sides to the question, if we agree to allow the Zionist Committee to make a submission to this committee we should accord the same privilege to the Arabs.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Diefenbaker was speaking on this subject too.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: My view is that there has been a request, and I think it is a reasonable request. I see no reason why the Jewish people should not be given an opportunity of making their representations here with regard to this situation.

Mr. MACINNIS: I move that these people be notified that we are willing to hear them.

Mr. JAQUES: I have been advocating this from the very first meeting, in fact before that; but I agree to this on the understanding that if we hear one side we will also hear the other side. If we are going to hear only the Zionists then I am absolutely and utterly opposed to this motion.

The CHAIRMAN: You understand, Mr. Jaques, that this matter does not originate with our committee; it originates with a wire which came from Mr. Zacks. There has been no pressure from this committee. I suppose it will be in order to notify the Arabs after we have heard Mr. Zacks and Mr. Mowat.

Mr. LOW: Let them make their own request. If they do make a request to be heard I would like to have it understood that this motion includes our willingness to hear both sides.

Mr. MACINNIS: May I say for Mr. Low's benefit that I am quite in favour of hearing the other side if they want to be heard.

Mr. LOW: That is right; if they want to be heard.

Mr. JACKMAN: If they apply.

Mr. MACINNIS: This matter should be made public so that the Arabs will know that the Zionists have asked for this privilege.

Mr. LEGER: Before we decide to hear these two witnesses I would like to mention that we are getting close to the end of the session.

Mr. MACINNIS: He is an optimist.

Mr. LEGER: Within a month, anyway. We all belong to a good many committees. Personally I belong to two committees, and I cannot spread myself in more than one place. We have been sitting in this committee for quite some time, and it is only for that reason that I am opposed to this action. May I say that we should be careful that no reflection is made regarding Great Britain who has that situation in hand.

The CHAIRMAN: Of course, we are protected to the extent that we are not going to make any recommendation on these representations.

Mr. LOW: That is right.

The CHAIRMAN: We will give both sides all the latitude they want but we cannot make any recommendation.

Mr. LOW: That is my view.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been moved by Mr. MacInnis and seconded by Mr. Knowles that the two organizations which have made application to be heard by this committee be informed that the committee will hear them.

Mr. LOW: Does that motion include both sides of the case? If the Arabs make a request we should also hear them.

The CHAIRMAN: I believe we should have a separate motion. Shall we carry this motion?

Carried.

Now, Mr. Low, will you present your motion?

Mr. Low: I move that if the Arabs wish to make a submission to the exter[illegible] Affairs Committee and express their desire to you to do so, sir, that we also accord them the same privilege as we have accorded to the Zionist organizations.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall that motion carry?

Carried.

We all realize that we are treading on new ground. Personally, I am not afraid of that new ground because it might afford a way for this committee to keep the public alert on this contentious question.

(The committee continued in camera.)

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
July 19, 1946.

The Standing Committee on External Affairs met this day at 10.30 o'clock a.m. The Chairman, Mr. J. A. Bradette, presided.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we will now call the meeting to order. This meeting will be almost an epochal one as far as the activities of the committee on External Affairs is concerned, because we have before us today a body of men and women who are going to bring to our attention and to the attention of the country at large, through this committee, a very very important problem throughthe whole world. We have with us this morning Mr. S. J. Zacks, president of the United Zionist Council, Mr. M. Garber, K.C., of Montreal, Mr. and Mrs. Harry Batshaw, K.C., of Toronto, Mr. Harry Friedman, K.C., of Edmonton, Mrs. A. Raginsky, president of Hadassah, Montreal, Mr. M. Gelber of Toronto, Mr. S. Jacobson, of Halifax, Mr. N. Levitsky, Barrister, of Montreal, Mr. Herbert A. Mowat, of the Canadian Palestine Committee, and Mr. Lawrence Freiman of Ottawa.

In this instance, as in an ordinary meeting of the committee we shall follow the usual procedure. The speakers will present their briefs, and following that, they will be open for questioning by members of the committee. I shall now call upon Mr. David Croll, a member of this committee, to make the opening remarks.

Mr. CROLL: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to say just a few words by way of introduction and by way of introducing this very distinguished committee which is here this morning.

The Zionist organization of Canada, of which I am, of course, a member, for your information reaches into every home in every Jewish community in the country. Even people who are not members of the Zionist organization—a very infinitesimal number—are very interested in its activities and they make contributions.

There are a great number of lesser Jewish bodies in the country, but I think it is fair to say that the Zionist organization represents the Jewish mind as does no other group in the Dominion of Canada. I want to thank the chairman and particularly the leaders, Mr. Graydon, Mr. Coldwell, and Mr. Low, with whom I have discussed this matter before. It was decided to hold this meeting with their cooperation. They were not only cooperative, they were enthusiastic about it, because of the significance of the present events in Palestine is, I believe, imperfectly understood by a large number of the public.

It is not, perhaps, for Canada to propose a final solution to the vexing problem of Palestine, although as one of the fifty-two signatories of the League of Nations Mandate, Canada has a responsibility. It is that responsibility that we want to bring to your attention today.

From the standpoint of humanity, we cannot stand aside and refuse to interest ourselves in a problem involving the fate of millions of men and women—and I emphasize—who fought on the side of the allies in this war, and who were the earliest and most defenceless of Hitler's victims.

We may not be called upon to solve the problem, but I think we have a duty and a responsibility to inform ourselves of the facts of the situation and to try to ascertain on which side justice lies. This we can do best by examining, for just a few minutes, the background against which the events of today are projected.

There seems to be a pattern of violence running through the history of temporary Palestine which may seem inexplicable to many people. Our purpose here today is to try to understand what is happening in that very small, very lovely, but very strategic area of the world. When I listen to discussions on events in Palestine, I hear from many quarters this question: "Well, what are they fighting about anyway?"

Perhaps it is a little hard for some of us here in Canada who have never known want or fear or starvation, who have never witnessed the brutal slaughter of our loved ones, to understand just "what they are fighting about". But I think the answer is a very simple one. They are fighting for justice.

I recall to this committee that some thirty years ago Britain, partly for reasons of strategic importance, and partly through genuine humanitarian motives, offered the Jews a national home in Palestine. This offer was embodied in the Balfour Declaration and in the League Mandate and was signed by fifty-two nations including Canada. The signatories to this document have pledged themselves to a course of action, and it becomes a question of honour that their pledge be fulfilled. That is my first point.

My second point is that in the past ten years the Jews of Europe have suffered untold horrors. Six millions of them were put to death—more than half the population of Canada—and the remnant that has been saved from Hitler's slaughter-house finds neither haven nor peace in Europe to-day. Their families are dead, their properties destroyed or disposed of, often legally, to people who don't want to give it up. In other words, they are excluded socially and economically from Europe which was their home. The Jews of Germany and Poland have passed through a bondage infinitely worse than that they knew in the land of Egypt. It becomes a question of humanity that we render them all the aid in our power.

While I do not condone terrorism, I do condemn heartily a policy which makes violence inevitable. For thirty years, from the Balfour declaration to the Anglo-American Committee's report, the pledge of Palestine as a Jewish haven has been reiterated. That pledge must be fulfilled. Justice asks it and humanity demands it. The Jews of Europe who were always Britain's friends, are to-day in concentration camps, while Britain's arch enemy, the Mufti of Jerusalem, goes free to do his mischief. Moshe Schertok, the man who raised 25,000 fighting soldiers in Palestine, is now behind barbed wire. The Jews of Europe who suffered so grievously cannot go back to a land of barbed wire and pogroms. They have always been a freedom loving people. They must be given the opportunity to live again free lives.

What is Canada's duty in all this? We cannot sign documents without taking some of the responsibility. We have, with others, jointly pledged ourselves to help reconstitute the Jewish national home in Palestine. Events of the past thirty years have shown difficulties in the way of bringing that about—yet they are not insuperable. The Anglo-American committee has proposed, if not a solution, at least a modus vivendi. All that this committee asks is that some method be found whereby these findings may be implemented. That, in the name of justice and humanity, is the very least that we can do.

I want to put on the record—and all the members of the House have received the speeches on Palestine in their mail—the statement made by Dr. Hugh Dalton in May, 1945.

Mr. GRAYDON: His speech was made in the British House?

Mr. CROLL: Yes, his speech was made in the British House.

> It is morally wrong and politically indefensible to impose obstacles to the entry into Palestine now of any Jews who desire to go there . . .
>
> What we have declared at this stage, however, is that if they, the Jews, desire to go to Palestine we should not stand in their way, but,

[redacted] the contrary, we should facilitate their going by the provision of various kinds of economic assistance in various forms for the development of the Land of Promise and Hope in a world which, for the Jews, has been blackened to an extent which none of us who are not Jews can begin to appreciate or to understand.

That is by Dr. Hugh Dalton, Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Then there is a very interesting statement made in December, 1944 at the Annual Conference of the British Labour Party by a distinguished gentleman, who is now the Prime Minister of England, the Right Honourable Mr. C. R. Attlee. It says:

> Here we have halted half-way, irresolute between conflicting policies. But there is surely neither hope nor meaning in a "Jewish National Home" unless we are prepared to let Jews, if they wish, enter this tiny land in such numbers as to become a majority. There was a strong case for this before the war. There is an irresistible case now, after the unspeakable atrocities of the cold and calculated German Nazi plan to exterminate all Jews in Europe. Here, too, in Palestine surely is a case, on human grounds, and to promote a stable settlement, for transfer of population. Let the Arabs be encouraged to move out as the Jews move in. Let them be compensated handsomely for their land and let their settlement elsewhere be carefully organized and generously financed. The Arabs have many wide territories of their own; they must not claim to exclude the Jews from this small area of Palestine, less than the size of Wales. Indeed, we should re-examine also the possibility of extending the present Palestinian boundaries, by agreement with Egypt, Syria or Transjordan. Moreover, we should seek to win the full sympathy and support both of the American and Russian Governments for the execution of this Palestinian policy.

Then one more word. I picked up a Toronto *Star* of yesterday, and this article came to my immediate attention. It is dated Rio de Janeiro, July 16.

> Joao Alberto Lins de Barros, president of the Brazilian immigration council said to-day on his return from the U.S. that it was proposed to take 100,000 central European immigrants to Brazil, the majority from displaced persons camps in Germany and Austria. Special United Nations commission would leave for Brazil July 25 to study the possibilities of moving the immigrants, he said. Mr. Lins de Barros formerly served as Brazil's diplomatic representative in Ottawa.

I have no doubt he learned considerable about immigration while in this country.

I am sorry, but there are at least four of us here who must leave before 11.00 o'clock to attend another committee, but I feel sure, and I say to all people in the room, that they are in safe hands, and that this committee will give this matter not only study but will make some report with respect to this matter.

The CHAIRMAN: I will now call on Mr. S. J. Zacks, president of the United Zionist Council.

S. J. Sacks, President of United Zionist Council, called.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, before entering into a discussion of the problem at hand, I should like to express the gratitude of the United Zionists' Council and affiliated bodies for the courtesy shown us in allotting this time for the presentation of a brief to your committee.

I would like to apologize if there is in this brief a repetition of some of the statements made by Mr. Croll. We did not get together beforehand, and the logic of the case and the sequence of the case mentions some of the matters of which Mr. Croll spoke.

We are all very much disturbed by reports of the recent events in Palestine. We come here to-day in the hope that we may be able to shed some light on the events of the last few years. As Canadians and persons earnestly concerned with the equitable and peaceful solution of world problems, we also come here asking for your help.

The pre-war tragedy of European Jewry, which concerned us all, has become dwarfed in comparison with the torment wrought by the German hordes. The enormity of the suffering that took a toll of 6,000,000 Jewish lives has not yet been understood by those who live beyond the pale of tyranny. Members of this committee might picture half of the population of Canada brutally despoiled and done to death with a savagery beyond the ken of civilized men.

A remnant persevered. Through all the horror and infamy, in simple men and women burned deep the hope that some day they would find freedom and live to see a world where love of God triumphed over the tyrant's creed.

Now, fourteen months after the cessation of hostilities in Europe, more than 100,000 displaced Jews live unwanted behind barbed wire in camps administered by Allied Military Government. In addition, many times that number merely exist from day to day among the 6,000,000 graves in that Europe where Hitler's legions have been vanquished, but where his spirit lives on. The almost daily reports of the murder of hapless Jews gives bitter reproof to those, who, like Mr. Bevin, would send them back to be the keepers of the gravestones of their people. Recent events in Poland, where 800 Jews have been murdered, will make for an immediate increase in the displaced person problem to, possibly, many times that faced by the Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry. And wherever these Anglo-American investigators went on their tireless missions they met the same cry—either Palestine or death. We are tired; we cannot remain here. We are tired of resisting. We would like to go to our home. Naturally, every person who is uprooted wants to go home.

I would like to submit a few statements of well-known figures on the historical and legal aspects of this problem.

Speaking in the House of Lords, June 27, 1923, the Colonial Secretary, the Duke of Devonshire, stated:—

> The mandate is not merely a national obligation; it is an international obligation, and the Balfour declaration was the basis on which we accepted from the principal allied powers the position of mandatory power in Palestine.

Field Marshal, Rt. Hon. J. C. Smuts, who was a member of the Imperial War Cabinet in 1917, informed the Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry:—

> All I wish to emphasize in this statement is that the Balfour declaration, made by the British government, assented to by the American and French governments, and subsequently solemnly confirmed in the mandate by the nations of the League—is a solemn and sacrosanct document, embodying a long range policy of Jewish immigration into Palestine, that it should be treated with respect as such, and that the fundamental rights thereby assured to the Jewish people should not be abridged or tampered with more than is absolutely necessary under the circumstances of the case.

Royal Commission of 1937 under Lord Peel answered the claim put forward by those who would whittle away the obligation to the Jews by stating:—

> Unquestionably, the primary purpose of the Mandate, as expressed in its preamble and its articles, is to promote the establishment of the Jewish national Home. (p. 39)

The touchstone of Zionist policy has always been co-operation with the mandatory power and the failure to carry out its commitment to the Jewish people has been viewed more in sorrow than in anger. Despite such co-operation, the government of Mr. Neville Chamberlain in 1939 announced the White Paper, which renounced the most solemn international engagements to the Jews. The Mandates Commission of the League declared this new policy to be illegal and the Labour Party refused to be bound by it.

Zionist efforts in Palestine which provided a new home for more than half a million Jews opened up wide opportunities for Arabs as well who have flocked in from all over the Near and Middle East.

Incidentally, more Arabs came to Palestine than to any other country. The Arab population in the last 25 years in Palestine has doubled. I do not know of any other country in that part of the world where that has happened.

Though they own less than 7 per cent of the soil of Palestine, by reclamation and irrigation, Jews have provided a firm base for their own economy, while indirectly providing room for an expansion of the Arab economy.

We all know some of the industrial development of Palestine. Palestine became a virtual arsenal in the last war. They saved many lives by their tremendous production of war supplies. We had every man, woman and child in the fight against Fascism.

The feudal stratification of Arab society has led many Arab politicians, who are largely drawn from those classes thriving upon the exploitation of their fellows, to reject the social advances which the Jews have brought to the country. This is the language of reaction and it should be remembered that the oppressed masses are not represented when the name of the Arab peoples is invoked in the chancellories of the world. A leadership that appeals to the prejudices and does not represent the interests of the Arab masses must be treated as suspect. The world has yet to be told of one significant social achievement of the Palestine Arab nationalists for their own downtrodden brethren. Persons really concerned with the welfare of these people might well ask if the Arab case has yet been made by those who claim to speak in the Arab name.

The outbreak of war was truly a test of common interest. In answer to an appeal by the Jewish Agency, a mass registration of Jewish volunteers for war service totalled 85,800 men and 50,400 women. It was proposed that a "Jewish fighting force" open to volunteers from Palestine and neutral countries, be formed. After protracted negotiations, the cabinet in 1941 took a favourable position, but opposition in the Middle East from officials who had been engaged in minimizing the role of the Jews in Palestine, brought the decision to nought. It was due to the personal interest of Mr. Churchill that late in 1944 a Jewish brigade group was organized.

In the first year of the war, Jews were only allowed to enlist in the proportion of one Jew for every Arab who came forward. When the British position in the Middle East became critical, the bar was dropped and more than 25,000 Palestinian Jewish volunteers saw service. The House of Commons was officially advised that 1,040 Palestinian Jewish soldiers were casualties, left behind in Greece when that small, but heroic British expeditionary force was evacuated in 1941. What percentage of the thin, valiant line that held Egypt and Suez for Britain was composed of Palestinians, we have not been allowed to learn. Sur-

rounded by treachery, Palestinian Jews volunteered by the thousands to fight. The role of others in the Near and Middle East is well known. Have not the rewards been uneven?

Dr. Chaim Weizmann, head of the Jewish agency for Palestine, expressed the paradox when he said that Hitler's collaborator, the ex-Mufti of Jerusalem "lives in a place in Egypt and Moshe Shertok, who recruited 25,000 young Jews for Britain's armies, is behind bars in the Latrum Detention camp". Why?

From two world wars, in which their contribution has been but small, the Arabs, largely through the efforts of others, have gained much and are now represented in the United Nations by five sovereign states. The recent declaration of His Majesty's Government before the Assembly of the United Nations foreshadows the entrance of another independent State, Transjordan, into the comity of nations. From one million square miles, which the Arabs had liberated for them, the nations have set aside only 10,000 square miles for the building of a national homeland for the Jewish people. But what have the Jews actually received? As a reward for their efforts, the Jews have been given barbed wire, blood and tears—barbed wire in Europe and now barbed wire in Palestine. They have a national homeland which the harried remnants from Europe may not enter. The *Illustrated London News* printed pictures of police dogs being trained to hunt down refugees on the frontiers. An iron curtain of cruisers, scouting planes and patrols has been set up to trap the harassed wanderers. Is this to be the reward of loyalty? Is this to be the peace that more than 1,250,000 Jews fought for in the armies of the United Nations? Must the leaders of the Jewish agency be spirited off to prison on the Sabbath morning and held for weeks without the laying of a charge? Must wanton destruction and the shooting of unarmed Jews be the best that the Atlantic Charter has in store for the land of Israel?

Mr. Attlee said that he would not impose a policy on Palestine by force, but what has he been doing? Why are those who were the mainspring of the Jewish war effort in concentration camps, if a policy of suppression is not being attempted?

Let us examine the history of violence in Palestine. For three years from 1936 to 1939, Jews were subjected to violence on the part of Arab gangs that were financed by Hitler and Mussolini and which got much of their support outside the country. More Arabs were the victims of this terror than Jews. Despite the presence of large bodies of troops, the violence was not suppressed. The Royal Commission of 1937 was of the opinion that the incipient revolt was not put down with sufficient vigour as a matter of policy. And yet the Jews maintained their patience.

As a result of this reign of terror, the government retreated from their obligation to the Jews.

Irresponsible, extremist Jewish groups denounced by the Jewish agency could no longer be controlled by the Zionist leaders. With the mounting tragedy in Europe, the spectacle of Hitler's victims being driven away from the very portals of freedom and the memory of the Arab victory, the strong hand of Esau rather than the wise counsel of Jacob appealed to a few.

The government say that the Jewish defence organization, Haganah, is armed. But this has been known for more than a decade. In fact the government helped to train Haganah personnel before the war and during the war many of the best people in this defence organization were used as intelligence agents and dropped by parachute behind enemy lines. To-day the government are exercised because Haganah is armed. It is also claimed that the Arabs are armed. Why has no attempt been made to disarm the Arabs? Because it is known that the Arabs can readily renew their supplies from the neighbouring countries. And that is why the Haganah must retain its arms, because

experience has shown that Jewish self-defence is Jewish security. That is true of history in all pioneering communities. Arabs respect Jewish self-defence. The government have not provided that protection. They cannot disarm the Jews and have only embarked on a policy or irritation. Peace will be restored in Palestine by statesmen and not by the police.

I must bring this to your attention, at this time, that the Jewish agency asked the British Government for permission to wipe out terrorism, and less than one per cent of the Jews in Palestine have been engaged in this work. The Jews abhor terrorism more than anything else.

The Labour Party came to power in Great Britain more heavily committed to a Zionist program than any previous administration. It made demands on behalf of the Zionists in excess of any ever made by the Zionist organization itself. But now, in power, it has been using British troops to make up for its failure to keep its pledged word.

Despite the bitterness sown by the present situation and the straining of the alliance, which has been the cornerstone of British and Jewish activity in Palestine, the long run needs of both parties must bridge the gap so that British interest and Zionist achievement can continue to make of Palestine a bastion of western democracy. The incidents and recriminations of the moment must not be allowed to obscure the great common tasks. Friends of Britain must wonder whether the present government will not have to retire from an impasse which has been created. When the present policy of irritation has been cast aside and the overwhelming necessities of the situation are recognized, will it not be asked whether the humiliation of two proud peoples could have been avoided?

We feel that the common interests of Jews and Britain in Palestine bring us much closer together, regardless of the many differences.

Canada has many interests in the situation in Palestine and six points are noted below:—

Firstly, British rule in Palestine is a trust, based on a mandate, approved by the League of Nations; and as a member of the League, Canada is one of the powers to which the Mandatory has been answerable.

And certainly, the notable financial contribution which Canadians have made for more than a quarter of a century towards the upbuilding of the country should direct that concern which our government always show in the welfare and protection of the interests of Canadians abroad, towards Palestine.

As for the immediate situation in Europe, Canada is making a generous contribution through UNRRA to ameliorate the lot of displaced persons and is therefore vitally interested in a permanent solution of this problem.

And possibly of more immediate concern may be the question of the maintenance of peace in the Middle East where a group of member states of the United Nations, is presently organizing trade boycotts and threatening war in violation of the terms of the Charter. Canadian representatives in the various bodies of the United Nations may be called upon to face a breach of the peace by Arab member states and therefore it is believed that the Canadian government should be informed of the issues at stake.

We certainly feel that the present boycott is something which the United Nations must deal with because it is a violation of the terms of membership.

Another reason for formulating official policy on the Palestine problem at this time is the imminent departure of the Prime Minister and his associates for the Peace Conference at Paris where problems, such as the disposition of Displaced Persons will be discussed. It is important that the official Canadian delegation bring to bear in the councils of the nations that informed and constructive counsel which has obviously been lacking in the handling of the Palestine problem.

It has always been the proud boast of Canadians that history has cast [redacted] in the role of interpreter between the two great English-speaking powers. The problem of Palestine has certainly caused much criticism of British policy in the United States.

Canadians, who understand well the language of their two partners, are uniquely equipped to carry the torch of understanding in the name of justice and fair play. Let the voice of Canada be heard.

We feel that Canada, as a part of the British Commonwealth of Nations, should see that fair play is observed at this instance.

We believe that a statement by the government of Canada, at this critical time, in support of the fulfilment of the recommendations of the Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry for the immediate admission of 100,000 Jews into Palestine, would be a material contribution towards the solution of this vexing problem.

Yes, we would even go further. We believe that bloodshed and the present difficulties in Palestine would be completely averted if Britain announced the acceptance of this recommendation. We believe that if Canada and the Canadian people raised their voices at this time, it would do much in alleviating our problem and in settling the great difficulty which faces all of us in Palestine and which threatens the peace and security of the world. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Zacks. I now call upon Mr. Mowat who is the Executive Director of the Canadian Palestine Committee.

Mr. H. Mowat, Executive Director, Canadian Palestine Committee, called:

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman and members of the External Affairs committee of the House of Commons: I wish to express regret that Sir Ellsworth Flavelle who is the national chairman of the Canadian Palestine Committee is unable to be present. To-day I am acting as his deputy. We thought we would like to render a separate brief on this subject, the information in which and the point of view of which would be supplementary to the brief which has just been tendered by the United Zionist Council through Mr. Zacks. It would give us an opportunity of presenting what, perhaps, would be an approach more kindred to the members of this committee who are not Jewish because we, of the Canadian Palestine Committee, are non-Jewish.

Our text in relation to Palestine is the Balfour Declaration policy. All who are associated with the Canadian Palestine Committee are associated with it on the basis of the British policy for Palestine being the Balfour declaration policy and the mandate, of which that Balfour declaration is the text.

We are in touch with the non-Jewish people in the United States who are interested in the Palestine issue, some of them, for political reasons of their own. When I am in Washington or in New York I find myself in the position of one who is strongly pro-British, and who seriously limits the ground on which he meets these people.

For example, when the World Committee for Palestine was formed last November in Washington, there was a putsch put on by the Latin-American delegation who brought in an amendment that the mandate for Great Britain should be immediately cancelled because of the failure to execute the pledge inherent in the mandate, and that the United Nations, which was an organization largely on paper at the time and incapable of assuming detailed responsibility of this kind, should immediately take over and execute the mandate of the League

of [redacted]ions from Great Britain. Now, that amendment was killed and it was killed by the debating power of the Canadian delegation at the world committee. We refused to go there unless certain pro-British guarantees were given.

Under the chairmanship of Senator Roebuck, the resolutions committee brought in a resolution for adoption by the World Committee. That resolution corresponds with the brief which is known to members of this House, which was tendered to the Canadian government by the Zionist organization of Canada and by the Canadian Palestine Committee. The Americans played a passive role. We fought it out in debate with the anti-British elements in the World Committee for Palestine. The American delegation came behind me with their representatives, while I was in the chair. They were supposed to take the chair at 11 o'clock, but they would not do so because they did not want to commit themselves. They felt that the seat was too hot! They whispered to me that if it came to a showdown, I could count on the votes of the American delegation to defeat the anti-British amendment.

After luncheon recess, the Latin-American delegation withdrew its amendment to the resolution. They wished to have the concession that, into the minutes of that session, should be written a statement in regard to Palestine, that the ultimate sovereign authority should be the United Nations. To that we were all agreeable.

I was interested in the sessions of the committee which sat in January. I have the greatest respect for the personnel of the Anglo-American committee, both British and American. They are human and they are highly competent. In this brief I have documented what I have to say with the report, with passages from the report of this committee. I did so because these men of the committee have been in a position to study all the facts for months, and most accurately, and because they have gleaned those facts from the people who are most intimately concerned with those facts and who are suffering the penalties which the report of this committee says it was designed to remove.

For instance, the British administrators pleaded with them that the Haganah be disarmed. They made a strong case for the disarmament of the Haganah, but six British members of this committee and six American members of this committee, making an assessment of the facts, supported by the strongest partisan proponents of the disarmament of the Haganah, refused to recommend that the Haganah be disarmed. The situation in the Middle East and the pledge of the British government to maintain public security in Palestine did not justify a recommendation of Jewish disarmament from the committee, which took into consideration all the facts.

This brief, gentlemen, is, as I say, documented from the Anglo-American committee's report on the Palestine issue. I have great confidence in the judgment of these men. I believe that any other document, even the statement of the British government, is junior in importance to the pronouncements of this committee who have studied all sides of this question so intimately. They are very human.

I remember at one of the sessions there was a rabbi sitting in the witness chair giving evidence. He had been expounding upon the economic character of life in the Jewish community in Palestine and said that while it had not made people exceedingly rich, neither were the people impoverished to the low level of subsistance living in the Middle East. The committee room was filled with twice the number of people we have here today—he said that such equal sharing was based on the principle suggested in the lines of the English poet, "A man's a man for a' that." The chairman of the American section looked at the rabbi and turned to the MacDonald in the American Section and said: "Good heavens, rabbi, the MacDonald will have your head for an error like that. You cannot credit England with that line. That is the line of a Scottish poet. It would be treason to credit that line to England!"

I mention that to show the human character of the people. They were decidedly human; yet the most rigid legal type was represented. That type, Mr. Chairman, which we all view sometimes with trepidation, was present.

This brief is an attempt to give definition to the position of Britain in Palestine in terms of obligation to the Jews of the world in general and the Jews of Palestine in particular, and then, too, the claims of the Arabs, from the British point of view. The foundation of British policy in Palestine is the Balfour Declaration.

When the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire was taking place at the Treaty of Versailles, Great Britain was the one power represented which had matured a policy in respect to Palestine. She had a policy also for the Arab provinces of that Empire. That policy was independence for the Arab countries, over a million square miles in extent, exclusive of Palestine. Thus the policy of the British government was a policy friendly both to the Arabs of the world and to the Jews of the world, and it had an appeal to the patriotic instincts of each.

The Balfour declaration was addressed to the Jews of the world—that is in the text of the Balfour declaration, "the Jewish people".—and its implementation meant the green light for those Jews who desired to enter and settle Palestine. Not that the British government felt that it was advantageous on the basis of ordinary standards of living for anyone to enter Palestine as a colonist. There was no stable dynamic economy to which the individual could become related, no untilled fertile soil which could be cultivated. Pioneers had to make the fertility of the soil by irrigation or other artificial distribution of water, or drain it of malarial swamp water before they could even make a start on a productive basis as colonists. But the British government reckoned, and not in vain, that there was a fair chance of Jews colonizing Palestine because of the historical association of their race and religion with the Holy Land. It was worth a try to see if they "would respond to the opportunity offered them" as Earl Lloyd George, war Prime Minister, stated before the Peel Royal Commission in 1937.

It was stated in the Balfour declaration that the Jews were to be offered a national home. It has been asserted that on this basis the Jews were never offered a Jewish state. But all official British pronouncements on this point assert that a Jewish state was not precluded under the original offer to the Jews of the world. The offer in Palestine was an offer of liberation from omnipresent minority status to the Jews all over the world who were suffering severe penalties from the defencelessness imposed by minority status. If the offer of the Balfour declaration did not mean the achievement of ultimate majority status for the Jewish community in Palestine, it meant very little indeed. Wherein would such a minority Jewish community differ from any other minority Jewish community in any other country. Certainly not in respect of being free of the dire penalties of homelessness.

This is important, gentlemen; it has not emerged with great clarity. But listen to this.

It was basic that a national home itself should provide a status for that transition and probationary period when a majority Jewish community was being built up in the Holy Land. Naturally no Jewish state could be set up after World War I when the Jews constituted only a small proportion of the inhabitants. If the prospective Jewish record and achievements merited consideration of statehood such record and achievements would win it—as Lord Balfour said: "an independent Jewish state . . . was a matter for gradual development in accordance with the ordinary laws of political evolution."

Thus the Jewish people after World War I started the enterprise of settling Palestine under the Magna Carta of the Balfour declaration and the Mandate, which had the Balfour declaration as its text.

235

By Mr. Graydon:

Q. What was the date of the Balfour declaration?—A. November 2, 1917, is the date of the Balfour declaration. But, more than this, it was the Magna Carta on which the British position as an administration in Palestine was based.

Chamberlain White Paper of 1939

As an appeasement measure to the Arabs the White Paper was, in the words of Churchill, "a breach of faith" to the Jews and a repudiation of the Balfour declaration. It laid down three departures from the initial Palestine policy of the mandate:

1. Rigid curtailment and in effect ultimate cancellation of the Jewish immigration.

2. Curtailment of the Jewish right for land purchase to 5 per cent of the area of Palestine.

3. The regulation of the population of Palestine so that it would be permanently frozen in the ratio of 2 Arabs to 1 Jew.

No more comment on this is necessary than to state the fact that the enforcement of such a policy over a period of years would make of the national home only a shadow of what the Jews had expected. It constituted a violation of and repudiation, as Churchill claimed, of the Balfour declaration.

The legal anachronism resulting from the passing of the White Paper has been described by Lord Samuel in a speech in the House of Lords last September:

Now, the lawyers can pay special attention to this because this is the pithiest and most convincing condensation of the legal situation in Palestine that I have read. It is worth noting.

> The policy set out in the White Paper was not in accordance with the interpretation which, in agreement with the mandatory power and the council, the (League of Nations) Permanent Mandates Commission had always placed on the Palestine mandate.
>
> There we have the present position in which we meet this afternoon to discuss the question of Palestine. The essence of the position is this—that the White Paper of 1939 is now in force, the five years are over, and the Balfour declaration never withdrawn by any government, is also in force, and that the one is in direct contrast with the whole spirit of the other.

By Mr. Jaques:

Q. Do you mind reading the Balfour declaration?—A. His Majesty's government views with favour the setting up in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing would be done to prejudice religious or civil rights of non-Jewish communities in Palestine or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country. That gives you the substance of it. The positive aspect of that mandate is to set up a national home for the Jewish people, and in setting up that home, no non-Jewish community is to be injured with respect to its civil or religious rights.

Q. Who is to decide?—A. Would you mind letting me proceed with my brief and then I shall answer your questions afterwards. I do not want to deprive those with legal acumen of this text; consequently I shall read from my brief.

> "But there is this difference between these two important instruments, and it is a very fundamental difference. The Balfour declaration was endorsed by all the allied and associated powers engaged in the first World War, including the United States of America. It was embodied textually, the very words of the Balfour declaration, in the Mandate for Palestine conferred by those states upon Great Britain, and approved

by the League of Nations itself. Consequently the Balfour declaration, embodied in the mandate, has the validity of international law; and if the question were ever to come up before an international court of arbitration, they must hold that it is valid in law, whereas the White Paper, which contradicts it, is the unilateral action of the British government alone, and therefore cannot be held to be valid when it is in conflict with the prior and more authoritative document."

To sum up—the mandate was awarded His Majesty's government in London on the strength of a British undertaking to sponsor the settling of Jews in a national home in Palestine, a recognition by Britain and of the world of the historical connection of the Jewish people with that country. An essential part of the arrangement was the formally expressed desire on the part of world Jewry to have the Palestine mandate given to Great Britain. How essential this was may be judged from the attitude of the Arabs who saw no reason for the British remaining in Palestine. The policy of their leaders was the same as it is in Egypt to-day—to have the British leave, and as quickly as possible.

How essential this may be when we consider the attitude of the Arabs, who saw no reason for Great Britain remaining in Palestine. This was the attitude then as it is to-day! Their policy was to have the British leave as quickly as possible.

Had the Jews not wanted Britain as mandatory it would have been difficult to reconcile the continuation of British occupation of the country with any sanction of international law. It had been agreed that conquest did not provide a legal basis of possession after World War 1, which the great allied powers had entered for two main reasons—and with the pledge that they were not going to add a single square mile of conquered territory to their already extensive territories—to defend the rights of small nations and to make the world safe for democracy. Had not the Jews, with their historical root in Palestine, invited the British to occupy the country as mandatory, it is difficult to imagine on what basis the continued presence of a British administration and military forces in the country could have been sanctioned by the allied and associated powers and approved by the League of Nations and the United States of America.

THE ARAB AND BRITISH PROMISES

For the Arabs the British policy was independence for the Arab lands of which Turkey had been sovereign prior to World War 1. Palestine was the exception to this offer of independence. One would have thought that such independence achieved by the might of British arms would have been a cause of Arab gratitude to Britain, but on the contrary the Arab politicians, instead of using this new independence to bring the blessings of modern progressive life to the Arab masses, have become engrossed with the exception, have villified Britain for it and have achieved a unity among the conflicting factions of the Arab world by their unanimous opposition to it.

Their claim of the British promise is based on the correspondence in 1915 of Sir Henry McMahon with King Hussein, the Sherif of Mecca. His Majesty's Government has never admitted this claim and the last official statement of denial was in the White Paper of 1939, paragraph 7, as follows:—

> His Majesty's Government . . . can only adhere, for the reasons given in the report, to the view that the whole of Palestine west of Jordan was excluded from Sir Henry McMahon's pledge, and they therefore cannot agree that the McMahon correspondence forms a just basis for the claim that Palestine should be converted into an Arab state.

THE PRESENT SITUATION

The most authoritative analysis of the factors which have been at work and which are still dynamic in Palestine is contained in the report of the Anglo-American committee. After analyzing the party differences among the Zionists of Palestine the report states that on the other side stands the Revisionist Party, numbering one per cent of the Jewish community, and beyond it the various more extreme groups, which call for active resistance to the White Paper, and participate in and openly advocate the present terrorist campaign.

The present resistance to the British policy in Palestine is elaborated by the committee as follows:—

> The Jew who lives and works in the national home is deeply aware both of his achievements and of how much more he could have achieved with the whole-hearted support by the mandatory power. His political outlook is thus a mixture of self-confident pride and bitter frustration: pride that he has turned the desert and the swamp into a land flowing with milk and honey: frustration because he is denied the opportunity of settlement in nine-tenths of Eretz Israel which he considers his own by right: pride that he has disproved the theory that the Jews cannot build a healthy community based on the tilling of the soil: frustration that the Jew is barred entry to the national home, where the community is now in being.

8. The Jews in Palestine are convinced that Arab violence paid. Throughout the Arab rising, the Jews in the national home, despite every provocation, obeyed the orders of their leaders and exercised a remarkable self-discipline. They shot, but only in self-defence; they rarely took reprisals on the Arab population. They state bitterly that the reward for this restraint was the conference and the White Paper of 1939. The mandatory power, they argue yielded to force, cut down immigration, and thus caused the death of thousands of Jews in Hitler's gas chambers. The Arabs, who had recourse to violence, received substantial concessions, while the Jews, who had put their faith in the Mandatory, were compelled to accept what they regard as a violation of the spirit and the letter of the Mandate.

9. An immediate result of the success of Arab terrorism was the beginning of Jewish terrorism and, even more significant, a closing of the ranks, a tightening of the discipline, and a general militarisation of Jewish life in Palestine. The agency became the political headquarters of a citizen army which felt that at any moment it might have to fight for its very existence. Desprived, as he believed, both of his natural and of his legal rights, the Palestinian Jew began to lose faith in the mandatory power. The dangerous belief was spread that not patience but violence was needed to achieve justice. The position of the moderates who urged self-restraint and a deliance on Britain's pledged word was progressively undermined; the position of the extremists, eager to borrow a leaf from the Arab copy book, was progressively strengthened.

Chapter V of the report concludes with "Any decision on the future of Palestine will be futile and unrealistic unless it is made in full cognisance of the political tension among the Jews and the reasons for it."

With all the facts before them the committee made a recommendation (A) that 100,000 certificates be authorized immediately for the admission into Palestine of Jews who have been victims of Nazi and Fascist persecution and (B) that these certificates be awarded as far as possible in 1946 and that actual immigration be pushed forward as rapidly as conditions will permit.

The above recommendation together with Recommendation Number 7, the replacement of the land transfers regulations of 1940 with regulations based on a

policy of freedom in the sale, lease, or use of land irrespective of race, com[illegible]ity or creed marks the repudiation of the White Paper in this report. B[illegible] the White Paper is still in force. It weighs more heavily than ever on a people, that Jews of Palestine and Europe, who have endured years of greater devastation and torment than any other groups in history. The steady deterioration of the physique and morale of the Jewish survivors in Europe would indicate that humanitarian considerations are not given a high enough rating by the British government. The report of the British and American committee members who surveyed all facts for months had a definite humanitarian urge. The situation today is this:

If a refugee Jew in Germany or Austria is successful in escaping from a concentration camp and reaching Palestine, he is ushered into another concentration camp—this time a British concentration camp—for an indefinite period.

At the conclusion of this informational memorandum we wish to mention that our committee has maintained that the way of greatest justice and of least injustice to all concerned with the problem of Palestine, living inside and outside its boundaries, is the setting of British policy back on the rails of the Balfour declaration and the Palestine mandate. On grounds of humanitarian considerations we agree with the Committee that the short-term policy recommendations of the Anglo-American committee should be implemented, the 100,000 Jewish victims of Nazi and Fascist persecution admitted to Palestine in 1946, and the discriminatory land transfer regulations rescinded. Such action on the part of His Majesty's Government would do much to restore the confidence of the Jews of the world in the desire of Britain to keep faith with those who, on her invitation, became her wards in Palestine. It would reassure those Jews who to-day fear the British intention of abandoning their outpost of western civilization in an area of feudalism dominated by a reactionary Arab hierarchy.

In recent months the British government seems to have taken the position that it is not now strong enough to go the course of mandatory in Palestine, and it must be admitted that there are so many evidences that this is the case that the claim must be taken seriously in any informational memorandum such as is now submitted to the External Affairs Committee of the House of Commons. The most significant statement which has emerged recently has come from Mr. R. H. S. Crossman, member of the Anglo-American committee and of the British House of Commons, and who moves in a circle which to-day has great influence on British foreign and colonial policy. At a recent meeting of the Anglo-Jewish Association in London Mr. Crossman concluded his address by mentioning the Jewish grievances against the White Paper which, many Jews remarked, had forced them to organize themselves against their friends, a most tragic thing to have to do. He continued:

> The necessity of getting unity between the governments of Great Britain and America on this subject of Palestine is absolutely par amount, for Great Britain cannot carry on a sound policy in Palestine alone. *I mean that quite seriously.* (our italics) A steady course in Palestine really demands a UNO, applied by a single power. But there must be behind a single power a common agreement with a policy that has to be carried out. Somehow we have to work out a world policy in regard to world Jewry, Palestine and the Arabs, and get world backing for its enforcement.

It is possible that to get justice for the Jewish people in the Palestine issue the United Nations must be invoked. In such an eventuality the role of Canada in its United Nations membership may be a beneficent one in regard to the vindication of the international pledges to the Jewish people approved by the League of Nations, belief in which caused so many to settle in Palestine. There

is no doubt, however, that settlement in Palestine, in which the government of the United States agrees and in which it shares responsibility with Britain, would meet with the approval of the United Nations.

The backing received by His Majesty's Government from the League of Nations was exceedingly weak. With stronger backing, as suggested by Mr. Crossman, Great Britain could function with greater success as mandatory in Palestine so long as a mandate is required in Palestine. The ultimate development of a Jewish Commonwealth, if the Jewish people of the world sufficiently support the settlement of Palestine to make that possible, will prove, in our opinion, the same bastion of strength to the British imperial security in the Middle East that it was in World War II. And their record in World War II as well as the Balfour declaration cry aloud that justice be accorded Jews in the matter of their ancient homeland.

Gentlemen, I have one or two items to add to this brief.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. May I ask a question? You quoted from Chapter V of the Jewish Report, the last paragraph. Did you quote the whole of the paragraph?—A. I think I quoted paragraphs 7 and 8.

Q. Did you quote the whole of that?—A. I didn't have time to quote the whole of it. It is all relevant.

Q. I think it would be worth while for you to read that?—A. I have read that.

Q. You did not read the whole paragraph?—A. No, I had to leave most of it out. I brought out the relevant parts in my brief.

I want to mention one or two things in closing that show the danger of a continuation of the White Paper policy, which is unjust. I can quote charges to this effect from men who have the respect of every person in this room, beginning with Winston Churchill. The danger is that these Jewish people in Palestine will become embittered with the application indefinitely of this unjust measure, which has been in force for seven years.

The Canadian Palestine Committee believe there is a basic gratitude on the part of the Jewish people to Britain that they have been given an opportunity to establish the framework of a homeland in Palestine. Where else would they have got that except in association with the British people? Everything they have to-day in substance of a national home in Palestine they owe to British instrumentality. That is basic in the platform of the Canadian Palestine Committee, and Canadian Jews appreciate that.

The Jews fought for the British cause in this war and they were ready to sink differences and place their talents at its disposal. They did that without stint. That sense of gratitude and goodwill has not yet been annulled by seven years of the White Paper, but it might be!

I submit to this committee the consideration of the proposition that there is basic gratitude on the part of world Jewry. When Crossman says implement the mandate by a single mandatory power, I agree with him. I want that mandatory power to be Great Britain. We will have the same kind of effective relations with Jews throughout the Holy Land that we had before the war. General Paget, G.O.C., was converted to the view that if the British troops pulled out of Palestine next month that there was no force in the Arab world that they could muster that would seriously embarrass the Jewish people in Palestine in the Haganah. They would be able to take care of themselves. They would be able to hold their gains without assistance. That was the opinion expressed by both the G.O.C. of British troops in Palestine and by the G.O.C. of British troops in the Middle East.

A strong position in the Middle East is necessary to the British Empire. In Palestine 15,000 troops could maintain order with machine guns, tanks, mobile artillery, motorized and parachute troops with aircraft cooperation. Members of the Anglo-American Committee stated there was a British force of 100,000 in Palestine last April.

Palestine is being used for the evacuation of British troops from Egypt. The strong British forces at present in Palestine are a military counterpoise to Russian in the Middle East.

One personal word as I conclude. You wonder why a person like myself, not being Jewish, should be concerned in this matter. In 1932 I was entertaining an old German Imperial Army officer in my home and in the confidence of the fireside he told me that in troubled times after world war I he had shot fourteen Jews in Germany, and he told me if I dropped into his home he would show me a Leuger revolver with fourteen notches in it. Each notch represented a Jewish life he had taken; and he showed me that with the same pride with which he would exhibit an Iron Cross if he had one.

I would not like to be at the mercy of people like that. If Germany is filled with men and sons of men like that there is something to be said for the Balfour declaration when the position of Jews became insufferable in that country. They had not sufficient numbers to fight back, and were at the mercy of people like my German officer acquaintance.

I never spoke to this officer again except when I met him outside my house to tell him what I thought of him. He told me that he had knocked down a man at the cenotaph in Toronto who had insulted the German army, that he had cheerfully paid a fine in the Toronto police court for the privilege of knocking down a man who had insulted the German army and that he would do that to any man who insulted the Kaiser or the Germany army. The next time I met him on the street I insulted the Kaiser and the German army and he made no attempt to knock me down. I concluded he was pursuing the traditional German line of not attacking anyone as big as himself. After that he always looked the other way when he saw me coming.

Gentlemen, the Balfour declaration has the sanction of humanitarianism on the very highest level.

In submitting this brief, which deals with the political aspects of a Palestine settlement, I say it is not merely a matter of politics but it is a matter which challenges our sense of justice and our finest humanitarian instincts in the interest of the afflicted who are helpless in the circumstances in which they are to be found to-day.

The CHAIRMAN: I will now call upon Mr. M. Garber, K.C., vice-president of the United Zionist Council.

Mr. M. Garber, KC., vice-president of the United Zionist Council, called.

The WITNESS: Gentlemen of the committee, I take it that you gentlemen are very anxious to ask questions of Mr. Zacks and Mr. Mowat, and I do not see any necessity for my addressing the committee, but while I am on my feet, I would like to make one or two statements.

Mr. Croll, in his able introduction, quoted from a speech made by Mr. Attlee wherein he went to the extent of suggesting that the Arabs of Palestine be moved out so as to enable Jews to move in. I want to state emphatically that this is not the policy of the Zionist movement. Throughout the past 25 years, while we were anxious to have Jews come in, we never suggested that the Arabs get out, nor did we raise any objection to thousands of Arabs coming in.

The result has been that the standard of living of the Arab was raised considerably with the influx of Jews and the introduction of western methods of production and agriculture. The standard of living of the Arabs in Palestine is higher than that prevailing with respect to Arabs in any other country.

Walter Clay Lowdermilk, noted soil conservationist of the United States Department of Agriculture, after making a survey of Palestine came to the conclusion that what we call the absorptive capacity of Palestine is considerable. He said probably 4,000,000 people could make their homes in Palestine, provided proper irrigation of the soil be carried out.

A gentleman asked for the wording of the Balfour declaration, and I would like to draw your attention, also, to some portions of the mandate which is contained in the report of the Anglo-American Committee. The mandate begins on page 76 and runs along the following pages. I am not going to read the whole preamble. The first paragraph laid down, as Mr. Mowat said, what was the basis of the mandate, namely the Balfour declaration.

The third paragraph is very interesting. It reads as follows:—"Whereas recognition has thereby been given to the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine and to the ground for reconstituting their national home in that country."

Gentlemen, I draw your attention to the word "reconstituting". It is not something new, subject to debate as to what form it should take. We all know what the Palestinian home was, say 22 centuries ago. It was a home like Canada. The mandate specifically says it should be "reconstituted", and the mandate was given in a formal, legal way and Great Britain is given the authority of mandatory. Canada is one of the members of the League of Nations, and Canada should be interested in the carrying out of the mandate.

Then there is Article 2:—

> The mandatory should be responsible for placing the country under such political, administrative, and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish national home, as laid down in the preamble, and the development of self-governing institutions, and also for safeguarding the civil and religious rights of all the inhabitants of Palestine, irrespective of race and religion.

And then there is Article 4:—

> An appropriate Jewish agency shall be recognized as a public body for the purpose of advising and co-operating with the Administration of Palestine in such economic, social and other matters as may affect the establishment of the Jewish national home and the interests of the Jewish population in Palestine, and subject always to the control of the Administration, to assist and take part in the development of the country.
>
> The Zionist organization, so long as its organization and constitution are in the opinion of the mandatory appropriate, shall be recognized as such agency. It shall take steps in consultation with His Britannic Majesty's Government to secure the co-operation of all Jews who are willing to assist in the establishment of the Jewish national home.

The second part says that the Zionist organization should be such agency until a broader agency is set up. It ends by saying that the agency shall engage the interest of all Jews throughout the world in the carrying out of the mandate. There is no similar Arab body appointed. The positive charge of the mandate is to reconstitute the Jewish national home; that appropriate conditions be set up for carrying it out and that a Jewish body be created for that purpose, but nothing of the same nature was contemplated for the Arabs.

The agency is a public body recognized internationally and receiving its authority from the same source as that vested in the mandatory power. For that reason we feel rather aroused when members of the agency, against whom no

242

charges are being laid, have been held in a detention camp for almost a [illegible]th without warrant, without due process of law. We maintain that that is illegal, and while it only affects a small number of individuals, Jewish people throughout the world have been aroused at this unjustifiable act on the part of the mandatory power.

May I say in conclusion that while all this political discussion and spirit of the mandate are important, our main purpose is to obtain some immediate, practical results. It has been shown that hundreds of thousands of our fellow Jews are in detention camps in various parts of Europe.

I ask that the recommendation of the Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry for the immediate admission of 100,000 Jews into Palestine receive the support of the dominion government.

Mr. S. J. Zacks recalled:

The WITNESS: Some eight months ago the President of the United States sent Mr. Earl Henderson to investigate at first hand conditions in Europe, and he brought back a report that the 100,000 Jews in concentration camps should be transferred immediately to Palestine.

Following this the British government asked the American government to appoint six members of a twelve member committee to investigate this whole situation, and testimony was taken in Washington and in London and in Palestine, and there was an unanimous recommendation. That was the suggestion of Mr. Harrison, and Mr. Truman has been asked that this be implemented. He has intimated that technical and financial assistance would be given. I have never heard of the suggestion that there may be military support, but I do not think there has been any formal request for that, but I believe Mr. Truman has stated that they will assure military aid. I believe, when the United States goes further, if it be necessary to go further, she is a responsible person and will realize what is involved in giving this type of undertaking. I know that the United States in the last few days has sent over a committee of some seventeen, consisting in part of technical experts; and I know that a counter part to that committee from England is considering ways and means of facilitating this recommendation. I know that one of the big problems is that of housing in Palestine. I believe this has been overcome also partly as a result of the intervention or the assurances by the United States.

By Mr. Graydon:

Q. May I ask Mr. Zacks this question? Is there any difference between the American official policy and the British official policy in this respect?—A. Britain has not accepted, in principle, the main recommendation of the Anglo-American committee, although the United States has.

By Mr. Beaudoin:

Q. Why do European Jews want to go to Palestine?—A. In my brief I mentioned there are between one and one-quarter to one and one-half million Jews alive in Europe but they are uprooted. They are living almost in graveyards. When they eat some food, they may think they are eating food that might have grown from, or been saturated with Jewish blood. It is a very hostile and inimical atmosphere. We have seen, in Poland, notwithstanding the fact that the government there has made anti-semitism a crime, there is a great deal of anti-semitism. Pogroms break out almost daily and the Jews live in constant fear. Naturally, they want to get out. They are afraid. You cannot

continue to live in fear. Most of the families are broken. Maybe only one or two members of a family are surviving, and they feel, if they are to start afresh, they should go to their own homeland where they are wanted. We have not heard of any other place where they can go. We feel that those who want to go to other countries should go; but 70 per cent of the people have already indicated a preference to go to Palestine because they are wanted there.

We were very much interested in the offer made by Brazil but we do not know how many will benefit from that offer. The main hope has been the haven of Palestine. There is, of course, this connection. Many of the Jews, during the war, inspired for hazardous service, were parachuted down into enemy lands to help in the ghettos. Many of the Jews in Europe escaped from Europe and went to Palestine. There are close relatives, sometimes of the first degree, in that country, and it is natural that they should want to join up with the remnants of their families. That is why they pin their great hope on Palestine.

By Mr. Fraser:

Q. How long would it be before Palestine could look after the food and clothing needs of its people without help from outside?—A. The Jews in Palestine have been very generous and have offered to share, without any restrictions everything that they have. They say: send us the Jews from Europe, and we will take care of them. There is always room, as Dr. Wiseman says, in your own home for the family. They are willing to share anything that they have without limitation. We feel that if 100,000 were brought in immediately, they could be taken care of and adequately looked after. It would be to the great relief of the whole situation. We would like to see larger numbers come; but we realize there are only 600,000 Jews in Palestine, and when they take in 100,000, with the help of Jews in other parts of the world, and perhaps with some governmental aid—when they do that that will perhaps be the limit for the present; but it is not the final limit. They could very easily take in and absorb into the economic life of that country 100,000 Jews.

By Mr. Graydon:

Q. Leaving aside the leaders of the Jews and the Arabs in the Palestine area, do the ordinary rank and file of the Jews and Arabs get along harmoniously?—A. I understand that there is very little tension even in recent months, between the Jews and the Arabs. I have talked to people who have come back from Palestine within the last few months. For instance, in connection with the co-operative marketing of oranges, Jews and Arabs came over together and sat around the table. Even in putting into effect the boycott, it is really not applied even in Palestine. There are certain needs coming from Palestine and they have been purchased from the Jews. I would say, for the most part, there has been very little difficulty, I think, as far as the masses of the Arabs are concerned. They feel that the Jews have been real benefactors in the upbuilding of their standards of living, more so perhaps than any other group.

By Mr. Knowles:

Q. Are there organizations in Palestine of which both Jews and Arabs are members?—A. They are both members in the trade unions. We understand that Arabs belong to the same trade unions as Jews. We have seen them, even in the strike recently. There were 50,000 people who went out on strike because of the very low wages. Both Arabs and Jews went out on strike together notwithstanding the fact that the Arab leadership tried to recall the Arabs from the strike, not wanting them to strike with the Jews; but nevertheless they struck together and won.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Do the findings of the commission bear you out in that statement, the evidence of the joint report?—A. There has been some reference, but I would like to see an even closer relationship. I feel that the Jews and Arabs have got to get along together in Palestine. I know that the attitude of the Jewish leaders is one of friendliness. I know that the committee, too, in one part of its report, felt there was a responsibility upon the Jews, even further, to help to bolster the standard of living of the Arabs; and they placed some of that responsibility on the Jews. I think, in a measure, we have done so. We have set up hospitals in Palestine; the major hospitals there have been set up by Jews and the Arabs have used them. Also physicians and universities as well as educational institutions have been provided and are available to the Arabs.

Q. I would draw attention to a point which bears your answer given to Mr. Graydon's question, which is on page 17 of the report, section 6, or rather paragraph 6. It says, in part:

> In short, the absolute unqualified refusal of the Arabs to acquiesce in the admission of a single Jew to Palestine is the outstanding feature of Arab politics today; and the newly formed parties of the left, based on the embryonic trade union movement display as intransigent a nationalism as the old leaders.

I think that refers to the Arabs in Palestine. I may be wrong, but that is my opinion.

Mr. BATSHAW: In answer to the question, I think you may have read in the magazine, "P.M." about four or five months ago, a series of articles written by Mr. Stone who went there when tension became so acute. He said that the astonishing thing to him was that, as you went through the country, you did not see many signs of tension between the Jewish peasants or Jewish worker and the Arabs. The actual worker in Palestine lives in peace even to-day. I have recently seen elsewhere references to that fact made by observers who got through the country. I myself was there in 1932 which was not long after the disturbances of 1929 in the city of Haifa. In the south of Palestine there was still some buildings that had not been reconstructed, but I found the common people going about their daily tasks uninfluenced by the intrigue that was going on in the higher circles.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Is your organization in favour of the implementation of the whole of the joint report?—A. Of course we feel that as far as Palestine is concerned we look upon that as the future homeland of the Jewish people, and I do not think we would retract from that stand, as far as the Zionists are concerned. Nevertheless, we feel that, and there is a majority of us who feel that, due to restrictive measures and difficulties, it is not possible for the Jews to go in there and constitute a majority. We would never believe in having a Jewish homeland unless the Jews were to be a majority there. The recommendation from that report, that a solution would be found for these 100,000 needy ones, that is the main recommendation. We agree with it in principle. As far as the long range recommendation is concerned, we may have some difference; but we do not think it is paramount or as important as the principal recommendation on which we are placing the greatest stress at the present time.

Q. You do not answer my question. My question is: is your organization in favour of the implementation of the whole of the joint report?—A. I cannot speak for the whole organization; I do not think they would be in favour of the whole report, but they are in favour of the short range immediate report.

By the Chairman:

Q. You are aware that there are also some very influential Jewish people both in America and in Europe that are anti-Zionists. I have received correspondence about it. Being Jewish, naturally, their statements will receive wide publicity and will be cited by all people who are interested in the solution of the Zionist question. Would you care to give us your reaction to that movement?—A. There is only one point I would make. They all agree there should be immigration of this 100,000. We are agreed on the "open door", and on the opening up of Palestine as a haven of refuge to the Jewish people. We do not agree with them politically; but they have rights to their thinking. We think the only answer to the homelessness of the Jewish people is the Jewish homeland; but they do not think so.

Q. In some of the difficulties would you have to face in Palestine, I understand they are not only geographical or regional because the country is a small one. Are there any language and cultural difficulties?—A. I would like to say that in Canada almost every Jew is a Zionist. The percentage of those people—and some of them are very influential, who are opposed to Zionism, might only constitute less than 5 per cent. Your question was?

Q. Are there cultural and language difficulties, and if so, are they insuperable?—A. I do not think there are real difficulties. There are three official languages and we respect them, the Arab, the Hebrew and the English language. The culture of each is certainly respected and the religion of each is certainly respected. There is not intention of the Zionist—which, after all, is a democratic movement, basically—to violate any of those fundamental precepts, in a matter such as this which we ourselves hold to be so important.

By Mr. Low:

Q. I have a question growing out of the one asked a few minutes ago. Is there any authoritative work on the number of Jews which the country of Palestine could absorb and keep in a decent standard of living?—A. There are many authoritative reports, notably that of Dr. W. C. Lowdermilk who is a soil conservationist and one of the heads of the Department of Agriculture in the United States. Another report is by a great irrigation expert, Mr. Russell. They claim that by irrigation and by damming the Jordan River it would be possible to increase the agricultural lands available for development and also help industry by providing additional power for at least 4,000,000 people to enable them to gain a livelihood in Palestine. It would be of great benefit to the peoples of the Near East. The American government has investigated this question and has sent over technical experts, Mr. Liliensell and Mr. Hayes who are very familiar with the Tennessee Valley authority. They think that in Palestine a comparable and similar type of development could be brought about and they have figures on expense. It is estimated that the preliminary steps would not cost over $250,000,000 and that it would be economically feasible. As a result of those expenditures, in the first stage, to provide occupation for at least one and one-half to two million people. That would be the first step.

Mr. BATSHAW: There is also a book based on the testimony of Mr. Nathan, a farm economist in the United States. The book is called: "Nathan Reports Nathan on the Palestine Problem", which deals extensively with the past, present, and the future as far as the absorptive economy and capacity of Palestine is concerned.

By Mr. Low:

Q. I had a reason for asking that question. There are two or three other questions that grow out of it. I have seen so many conflicting statements regarding the capacity of the land of Palestine to absorb an adequate

number of Jews that I wanted to get something authoritative on that question. Now my next question is this: how many would go back to Palestine?—A. We have heard that in Europe 70 per cent of the one and one-half million surviving Jews are ready to go back. There may be a few in other parts of the world too, but there would not be any great number. I would say about one million Jews would like to go back to Palestine.

Q. You say that about a million Jews want to go back to Palestine. Could Palestine then be a national home for the Jews in a physical sense? You see what I mean? You have partly answered it already, but let us go just a little further. How many Jews are there in the world?—A. About eleven to twelve million.

Q. Well, suppose six million of those Jews wanted to go back to Palestine, would it be physically possible?—A. The absorptive capacity of a country—Sir John Simpson in 1930 said that Palestine is not big enough to swing around a cat. But since that time we have had three hundred thousand people come in, and the country has prospered. We have developed a lot of the resources there, such as the chemicals in the Dead Sea, and we have established new industries. People did not think we could have a diamond industry but through the war there was one established, and we exported during the war, $25,000,000 worth of products from that industry which netted the British over $25,000,000 in American credits which the British needed. Over 2,000 factories have been developed in Palestine which is becoming an industrial as well as an agricultural centre. So with ingenuity you can certainly extend the absorptive capacity of that country. It has been said that for every person who settles a land, about three other people will be gainfully employed in the country. According to the Lowdermilk scheme, it is estimated that 250,000 people can be accommodated or provided for in the farming settlements which would mean, perhaps, 750,000 people who would be made employable. Multiply that by three or four times and you will get the total number who could come to Palestine and find gainful employment. I do not say that Palestine could absorb six million people. We do not know. Industry is constantly changing. It might change. From 1930 to the present we have seen tremendous changes. Necessity and invention constantly change the nature of settlements. It is something which is not static. It is a very hypothetical question, and is not a real question.

Q. I thought I recognized in Mr. Mowatt's remarks allusion to another sense in which Palestine was to be a national home for the Jews. I do not think that the average person understands that sense. Certainly it could not be purely physical, because the land now is incapable of absorbing two million Jews even if they wanted to go back. There is another sense in which Palestine is to be the national home of the Jews. I would like to have someone who is confident to do so, explain that for a moment.

Mr. GARBER: In the initial state of our movement we did not emphasize a great deal what we hoped that Palestine would be a sort of spiritual centre for the Jews throughout the world. In other words, we would all look with pride upon Palestine, and we ourselves will derive a certain amount of spiritual sustenance; our ancient language of Hebrew would be revived. A good many of us still speak Hebrew. Our prayers are said in Hebrew. Our Hebrew literature would grow up again, and Hebrew teachers would come from Palestine and in a sense, the law will again emerge from Palestine for the Jews throughout the world. But we are not emphasizing this at the moment, due to practical problems. We have hundreds of thousands of Jews who need Palestine as a physical home. We harbour the thought that a community of from one to two million Jews in Palestine will develop a Jewish culture which will grow to be a credit of the Jewish people and which people would benefit culturally.

But that was never meant to apply with respect to the Jew in South America or in Canada or in the United States, that he should consider himself to be a citizen of Palestine. Here in Canada we consider ourselves to be citizens of the English speaking community. This is entirely overshadowed by the physical and economic requirements of hundreds of thousands of Jews over the next twenty-five years.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Regardless of the future possibilities, the absorptive possibilities of Palestine, to the extent that Mr. Low has mentioned, there is no doubt as to the ability of Palestine to absorb 100,000, that he has mentioned?—A. No doubt at all. There has been no unemployment in Palestine. Every time we were wrangling with a mandatory power about an attempt to enter ten thousand or twenty thousand Jews, the answer always was that the absorptive capacity of Palestine would not permit it. Dr. Weizmann once answered it when a British statesman came to his laboratory and asked: "What are you doing?" He said: "I am creating absorptive capacity." The reuslt was that throughout fifteen years they got in 10,000 Jews, although it was contrary to the expressed opinion of Downing Street. But we have proved that we could do it.

Mr. JACQUES: May I say that I was the first in this committee to request that the Zionists be heard before it, and I made myself quite a nuisance every time I came here. I do not say that in the last analysis that my request was granted. I do not think it was. I just want to put that on record that I was the first one to request that these people be heard, and I said we might get some truth on the matter, and we can hear both sides of the question. I made a few notes while Mr. Mowat was talking and I would like to ask him a few questions.

Mr. Herbert Mowat recalled

By Mr. Jacques:

Q. Mr. Mowat, you admit that Palestine is sacred to Christians and Mohammedans?—A. Yes, I admit that, Mr. Jacques.

Q. A national home was not exactly what was meant in the Balfour declaration? Does it not say here that nothing shall be done which may prejudice civil and religious rights on non-Jewish communities?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you consider a Jewish state in the spirit of the Balfour declaration? —A. I consider that the rights, civil and religious, would be mandatory for all and would be observed in a Jewish State. As I say, I regard Palestine as a holy land. Jews, Moslems and Christians all look to Palestine as a holy land, but those two latter religious have a common parent, Judaism. The people who formed that religion with its inspired Old Testament literature are the only people of these three religious groups that ever constituted a sovereign Jewish state in Palestine. Always it has been a branch of a larger political group. So there is a priority of consideration there for the cause of a Jewish state.

Q. You will admit that the Arabs have rights?—A. Yes.

Q. I believe in a letter you stated: "I do not think Arab threats directed at Great Britain, the United States and other members of the United Nations Organization should be taken too seriously. They are a species of blackmail from a primitive people by which they have profited in gold and various concessions in the past. Threats of violence have been the Arabs most profitable stock in trade. How much longer are the great powers going to appease them? There is no doubt that a policy on Palestine agreed upon by the United States, Great Britain, and the other United Nations will be one to which the Arabs will

be forced to adjust themselves." Is that observing Arab rights?—A. Yes, that their political and religious rights, of course we can take for granted will be observed under a United Nations settlement. Protests of the Arabs, which is directed at Great Britain and world opinion are the protests of the feudal leaders of the Arab world, who see their entire system being broken down.

Q. In other words, it is proposed to impose an alien culture on the existing and original Arab culture?—A. No.

Q. Do you call that culture primitive and feudal?—A. Yes; no more than you can say that the culture of Canada in its Anglo-Saxon fashion is imposed upon the French-Canadian population in Canada. Any settlement of the United Nations would respect their rights, but not necessarily their interpretation of those rights. There is no such thing as a perfect settlement based on justice in any political sphere. We in Canada know that. The United Nations would see that they are not forced to surrender their existing and original Arab cultural rights mentioned in your question.

I think the letter which you quoted takes no exception to my present interpretation of a settlement favourable to the Jewish national home.

Q. With regard to the land, you will admit that the Arab people have been there for time immemorial; that even before the first children of Israel entered Palestine, they were on the land? Is it or is it not a fact that to-day in Palestine when a Jew or Zionist acquired land from an Arab that in the agreement of sale, it says that never again can that land be owned or even worked by an Arab?—A. That is self-defence on the part of the Jews. There are Moslem areas in Palestine unalienable from Moslem ownership, and the Jews, in self-defence, are forced to make that land their own when it is purchased by the National Fund.

Q. Is that not one of the points of contention for the British government to amplify?—A. I think if the mandatory prevailed upon the Moslems to surrender their unalienable rights to land, the whole matter might be opened up for resettlement. This is just my personal opinion.

Q. With regard to the first war, is it not a fact that the Arabs in Britain's hour of need, when the Suez Canal was threatened by the Turks, that under Lawrence of Arabia, the Arabs were persuaded to join in against the Turks, provided Britain guaranteed their rights?—A. Have you read the *Seven Pillars of Wisdom* by Lawrence? If you read that, you will see that they did not have great value. Lawrence said two Turkish battalions could disperse the whole of the Arabs. At the end of World War I Turkish Garrisons were unconquered in the cities of Arabia. For what measure of work they did, they were well paid, but Lawrence's opinion of the Arabs is given in the *Seven Pillars of Wisdom*. As a matter of fact, Lawrence was a great friend of the Jewish national home. He said that the successful development of the Jewish settlement would raise the level of subsistence living of the Arab masses more than anything else would, and would provide a ferment powerful enough to penetrate the whole of the Middle East.

Q. The Arabs gave every assistance they could in the first Great War, and also Lawrence of Arabia was offered very high honours for services rendered. He refused because he said the British faith had been broken, and another great authority as to the value of Arab armed assistance is Liddel Hart, one of the great military critics?—A. In the *Seven Pillars of Wisdom*, Lawrence of Arabia said:

> I do not wish to publish secret documents, nor to make long explanations: but must put on record my conviction that England is out of the Arab affair with clean hands. Some Arab advocates (the most vociferous joined our ranks after the Armistice) have rejected my judgment on this point. Like a tedious Pensioner I showed them my wounds (over sixty

I have, each scar evidence of a pain incurred in Arab service) as proof I had worked sincerely on their side. They found me out-of-date, and I was happy to withdraw from a political milieu which had never been congenial.

Q. What about Zionist threats; for instance, referring to the United States loan to Great Britain?—A. I am glad to answer that. A formal statement came out last week from Rabbi Wise, who is president of the Zionist organization, who said that although he was critical of the British policy in Palestine, he said he was personally supporting the loan, and asked everybody else to do the same. We have not been happy over the people in the United States who talk anti-British on the loan. We repudiated them. I noticed that the Committee of Political Action on Palestine had an advertisement in which they advised the people to write their congressmen to kill the loan. I noticed the resignation from that organization of people who were members of the American Palestine Committee—the non-Jewish organization in the United States corresponding to our Canadian Palestine Committee.

Q. You will admit that there is, at the present time, very violent Zionist anti-British propaganda on foot?—A. Yes, I have read it.

Mr. ZACKS: By a very small group. I would say that group would represent less than five per cent of the Zionists.

Mr. JAQUES: Has the Zionist movement repudiated this?

Mr. ZACKS: Yes. I would correct Mr. Mowat. Rabbi Stephen Wise is president of the Zionist Emergency Council.

Mr. JAQUES: Do you admit that all Jews are not Zionists?

Mr. ZACKS: Oh, yes. There is a small fraction of them who are not Zionists.

Mr. JAQUES: There is a law in Palestine at the present time against the carrying of arms by private citizens. It is a capital offence. A question was asked in the British House of Commons as to how many had been executed for carrying arms in Palestine, and the answer was given by the present Colonial Secretary. Do you know the answer he gave?

Mr. ZACKS: No.

Mr. JAQUES: I think you said the well-armed Zionist forces could defend themselves even if the British Army were to retire from the scene?

Mr. ZACKS: I gave that as an opinion of a G.O.C. before the committee.

Mr. JAQUES: May I say that according to the present Colonial Secretary of Great Britain, of 133 persons who have been executed for carrying arms that 132 were Arabs. We have the statement here that the Zionists could defend themselves.

The WITNESS: I do not think they carried their arms around on the roads and highways of Palestine.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall we continue on? We had hoped that we would be finished by now. There are four other committees sitting, and I would ask the members to remain for another ten or fifteen minutes.

Mr. LEGER: I think we should have the privilege of asking these gentlemen some questions.

The CHAIRMAN: When should the next meeting be?

Mr. LEGER: Can we not meet this afternoon?

The CHAIRMAN: I doubt if we can get a quorum.

Mr. LEGER: Can we meet to-morrow?

The CHAIRMAN: Why not on Monday?

250

Mr. Low: I think that would be satisfactory.

The CHAIRMAN: I will try to have the committee meet early.

I believe I voice the sentiments of the committee when I say I appreciate what material has been given to us this morning. I know that we all realize the function of the committee. We cannot make a recommendation on a matter of this kind, but you all must realize that we are getting much information, which will receive national publicity.

Mr. LEGER: Would it be possible to have copies of the record in our mail as soon as possible so we may have them before we meet again?

The CHAIRMAN: You realize how hard it is to do that. However, we will do the best we can.

The committee adjourned at 1.00 p.m. to meet again on Monday, July 22 at 10.30 a.m.

251

SESSION 1946

HOUSE OF COMMONS

STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 15

MONDAY, JULY 22, 1946.

WITNESSES:

Mr. H. A. Mowat, Secretary Canadian Palestine Association;
Mr. M. Garber, K.C., Vice-President, United Zionist Council;
Mr. A. A. Heaps, Ottawa.

OTTAWA
EDMOND CLOUTIER, B.A., L.Ph., C.M.G.,
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
1946

252

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

MONDAY, July 22, 1946.

The Standing Committee on External Affairs met this date at 10.30 o'clock a.m. The Chairman, Mr. Bradette, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Benedickson, Bradette, Coldwell, Croll, Fleming, Fraser, Jackman, Jaenicke, Jaques, Knowles, Leger, Low, MacLean, Marquis, Winkler.

In attendance: Messrs. M. Garber, K.C., Vice-President United Zionist Council, H. A. Mowat, Secretary Canadian Palestine Committee, A. A. Heaps and Lawrence Freiman, Ottawa.

The Committee resumed examination of witnesses from meeting held 19th inst.

Messrs. Garber, and Mowat were called, examined and retired.

Mr. Heaps described a tour of Palestine he made twelve years ago, he portrayed the agricultural, industrial and economic development, was examined by the committee and retired.

It was decided to hear representations from the Canadian Arab Association on Friday, July 26.

On motion of Mr. Leger committee adjourned to meet again at the call of the Chair.

F. J. CORCORAN,
Clerk of the Committee.

69091—1½

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

July 22, 1946.

The Standing Committee on External Affairs met this day at 10.30 o'clock a.m. The Chairman, Mr. J. A. Bradette presided.

The CHAIRMAN: Now we have a quorum, and I shall call the meeting to order. I want to thank the members of our committee for finding it possible to come at this early stage of the week. I want to compliment them in this instance.

At the Friday meeting the witnesses and members of our committee deserve to be praised for the manner in which they dealt with the very delicate and educated questions. It was a new experience that we tried out in our activity. I would like to quote what the Prime Minister stated on the 16th of this month dealing with the Palestine question:

> I do not believe that any useful purpose would be served by a statement on the situation in Palestine by the Canadian government at the present moment. Representatives of the United Kingdom cabinet, the foreign office, the colonial office and war office are discussing in London with representatives of the United States state department, war department and treasury, the recommendations recently submitted to the governments of the United States by the Anglo-American committee of enquiry which examined the problems of European Jewry and Palestine. The Canadian government hopes that the conversations now in progress will lead to a decision which will do justice to the various groups having a legitimate interest in Palestine.
>
> It will be noticed that I have placed emphasis on the present moment. I believe there are times and seasons for all things, but this I submit is not the moment, while these negotiations are on, for the government of Canada to take a particular part by way of making the statement such as the hon. members suggest.

That was given in answer to a question asked by a member of parliament. I reiterate the statement because again I must compliment all the people who were present here last Friday for the attitude they took. In dealing with a matter of this kind we may, if we are not guarded in our statements, touch upon the natural sensitivity of other governments. It is a sensitive and delicate question, but the way in which it was dealt with by our committee was of wonderful help, I believe, towards the solution of that great, great question.

The idea of the committee now is to continue with the questioning. I must apologize to Mr. Mowat for telling him that the next meeting of the committee was to be on Tuesday. I had forgotten that we were to meet again this morning. Now I believe it will be in order for Mr. Jacques to continue the questioning that he started last Friday.

Mr. JAQUES: The Jewish persecution in Europe has been mentioned; but now that Hitler is dead and the Nazis are dead, who is responsible for any persecution or persecutions there may be in Europe today?

Mr. GARBER: Hitlerism is still alive.

Mr. JAQUES: What do you call Hitlerism?

Mr. GARBER: The doctrines that Hitler disseminated during his lifetime are bearing fruit in many parts of Europe to-day.

Mr. JAQUES: May I observe that, according to the Communists, anybody who was not a Communist is a Fascist or a Nazi. Complaint has been made in the House more than once of Jewish persecution in Canada. Do you say that there has been any such action by anybody in Canada?

Mr. GARBER: Decidedly not.

Mr. JAQUES: You say "decidedly not"?

Mr. GARBER: I say, "decidedly not".

Mr. JAQUES: I think the statement was made on Friday that the Balfour Declaration excluded Palestine. That statement was made, I believe.

Mr. MOWAT: I made the statement that the British ruling on the promises made to the Arabs world excluded Palestine from any promise of Arab independence, and I quoted the British official dictum on that point contained in the White Paper of 1939. I should be glad to place the quotation again in the record if you wish to hear it. In 1939 we had the latest official British pronouncement in regard to promises of Arab independence which rules anything on the basis of the McMahon correspondence out of court.

Mr. JAQUES: Then there should be no need for me to read the Balfour Declaration which states specifically that His Majesty's government views with favour the setting up in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing would be done to prejudice religious or civil rights of non-Jewish communities in Palestine or the rights and privileges enjoyed by Jews in any other country. That seems to me to be a most definite inclusion of Palestine.

Mr. MOWAT: Political promises were made to the Jewish people and the protection of civil and religious rights were guaranteed to the non-Jewish communities in Palestine but not any political status of the Arabs as a group in Palastine.

Mr. JAQUES: Then what about the McMahon Agreement?

Mr. MOWAT: As to the McMahon Agreement, the validity of this claim for Arab independence in Palestine—I am reading from the 1939 White Paper on Palestine—of the British government:

> Based on the correspondence passed between Sir Henry McMahon and the Sherif of Mecca was thoroughly and carefully investigated by British and Arab representatives during the recent conference in London. (Command Paper 9574). His Majesty's government adhere to the view that the whole of Palestine west of the Jordon was excluded from Sir Henry McMahon's pledge, and they therefore cannot agree that the McMahon correspondence forms a just basis for the claim that Palestine should be converted into an Arab state.

Now, the argument is that of the British government, and I do not think that any person should be examined by this committee on that point.

Mr. JAQUES: Articles of Agreement were signed by Emir Feisal and Dr. Chaim Weizmann. Emir Feisal added the following rider:

> Provided the Arabs obtain their independence as demanded in my memorandum dated the 4th of January, 1919, to the foreign office of the government of Great Britain, I shall concur in the above articles. But if the slightest modification or departure were to be made, I shall not then be bound by a single word of the present Agreement which shall be deemed void and of no account or validity, and I shall not be answerable in any way whatsoever.

That rider was added by the Emir Feisal. I get that from a book by George Antonius entitled, *The Arab Awakening*. Then we have President Roosevelt's promise made to King Ibn Saud—

Mr. Low: Is that the one made during the war?

Mr. JAQUES: Yes; I might say that in 1922 the United States Congress passed the following resolution:

> That the United States favoured the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights enjoyed by all other non-Jewish communities in Palestine which shall be adequately protected.

Mr. MOWAT: Are you asking a question? What about Ibn Saud? What is your question about Ibn Saud, Mr. Jaques?

Mr. JAQUES: I was going to ask you if this was so: that on the 5th April, 1945, President Roosevelt stated in a letter to King Ibn Saud:

> Your Majesty will also doubtless recall that during our recent conversation I assured you that I would take no action in my capacity as chief of the executive branch of this government which might prove hostile to the Arab people.

Then, on October 27, 1945, President Truman, in a speech on Navy Day said:

> We believe that all peoples who are prepared for self-government should be permitted to choose their own form of government by their freely expressed choice without interference from any foreign source. That is true in Europe, in Asia, in Africa, just as well as in the western hemisphere.

Mr. MOWAT: My answer to that point is the evidence of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, who was giving evidence in regard to her husband's conversation with Ibn Saud. She revealed that the late President told her about his conversation on Palestine with King Ibn Saud, and emphasized that she considers it "not only unfair but very unwise" to use past utterances to influence new decisions. The statement made in her syndicated column, was prompted by Mrs. Roosevelt's desire to clarify the rumours surrounding the exchange of correspondence between her husband and the ruler of Saudi Arabia which was made public by Secretary of State James F. Byrnes. Pointing out that one can really never tell what a man who has been a thinker and a leader in either public or private life, would think or do if he were alive and facing new circumstances. Mrs. Roosevelt writes:

> I had heard my husband, on a number of occasions after his return from Yalta, give an account of the visit paid him by King Ibn Saud. My husband stated that he felt his conversations with the Arab King had been a failure since the King had told him that as long as he lived he did not wish any change.
>
> An influx into Palestine of Jewish people from the big cities of the world like London, Paris, Berlin, New York, would meet resistance because it tended to change the way of life of the whole land. "The Arabs," said King Saud, "are of the same Semitic race as the Jews and get on well when their backgrounds are similar." My husband said that King Ibn Saud had been a warrior all his life; he was not interested either in farming or forestry; his people were herdsmen and nomads, and he wished no change. My husband felt that a later generation might feel differently, but at present there was very little hope of a changed attitude on the part of the Arabs where Palestine was concerned.

Mr. JAQUES: That, of course, is merely Mrs. Roosevelt's interpretation.

Mr. GARBER: May I supplement? Our claim is based on the Balfour declaration and on the mandate which flows from the Balfour declaration. The mandate was approved by the council of the League of Nations consisting

of 52 nations. The United States not having been a member state of the League of Nations entered into a treaty of its own with Great Britain whereby the terms of the mandate were approved as far as the United States government was concerned. Now, any utterance made by any political personage on the particular circumstances which would be in violation of those three documents, the Balfour declaration, the mandate and the treaty between Great Britain and the United States, would not affect the basic question of the rights granted previously.

Mr. JAQUES: All those statements as to policy date from the Balfour declaration, but personally I have never understood on what Mr. Balfour based the right to issue the declaration in the first place?

Mr. MOWAT: It was a right contingent upon the sanction of the international authority, a right in the first instance of the allied and associated powers who won the war, and in the second place by the approval of the League of Nations which represented and spoke for the international community. It was contingent upon that authority.

Mr. JAQUES: In other words, it was a right which was conferred upon Great Britain or the British government or Mr. Balfour, whichever you like, by right of conquest, and I have always understood it was not a war of conquest; it was just the opposite?

Mr. MOWAT: It was contingent upon the validity of international law which was a matter of world agreement, and approval of the League of Nations. The Balfour declaration was contingent upon that. What Great Britain had been doing was formulating a policy in regard to Palestine.

Mr. JAQUES: Because they had a mandate?

Mr. MOWAT: No, they did not have a mandate until 1922. They formulated a policy in regard to Palestine and when the treaty of Versailles was in process of formation Great Britain appeared before the people who were the contracting parties to the Treaty of Versailles in the unique position of being the only great power that had a mature policy in regard to Palestine. Therefore she was in a unique position to receive the consideration she did receive in having the mandate conferred upon her. She got the mandate conferred upon her on the basis of an interested party who had a stake in Palestine extending an invitation that the mandate be conferred upon Great Britain by the League of Nations.

The Arab policy was clear. When the war was finished Great Britain should get out. If Great Britain had waited for an invitation from the Arab world or from the Palestinian Arabs to remain in any capacity in Palestine she would be waiting yet. But here was a people, the Jews, who had an incontestable historical association with Palestine. That was represented to the League of Nations as a basis for a mandate to a power that would sponsor a national home for the Jewish people validated by the incontestable historical association, and that gave legal sanction for the mandate.

If that had not been provided what would have been Great Britain's position in Palestine? She would have had no possession on the basis of Arab cooperation, but she had a legal position in Palestine that the League of Nations saw fit to validate because world Jewry, to whom the Balfour declaration was addressed, cooperated and asked that the mandate for Palestine be conferred on Great Britain. Had they refused to extend that invitation possession of Palestine by conquest was not on the score of settlements in World War I. That point has been raised by Mr. Jaques. Great Britain and the United States had abjured any pretention to the extension of their already generous territories by conquest, so they were not in a legal position in which to set up continuous holding of Palestine territory in any administrative or other capacity.

Evidence on this point was submitted to the Anglo American committee by Field Marshal Smuts. This is what he says:

> I shall have no opportunity to give oral evidence before the committee, but consider it right and proper to clear up one point, which I consider of great importance for the information of the committee.
>
> That point is the question whether the Declaration was at its inception meant to be a mere temporary expedient out of a present difficulty, or was intended to be a declaration of long range policy for the future. It must be important for the committee to know whether, in the minds of the original authors of the Declaration, it was planned as a firm policy for the future, or merely as a temporary plan to deal with an existing problem of a passing nature. Clarity on this point must have a close bearing on the question of large-scale revision, or even abandonment of the plan embodied in the declaration. It is on this particular point on which I wish to make the following statement of my clear impression and understanding of the scope and intention of the Balfour Declaration.
>
> I am quite clear that the Declaration was meant to be a statement of long-range policy for the future. Of course all human policies are subject to change of circumstances, and to revision in the light of such change. But there is no doubt in my mind that the Declaration was meant to affect permanently the future course of events in Palestine, and was so conceived by those who took part in its formulation.
>
> When the Declaration was made in 1917 there was no sudden emergency calling for an executive plan. There was no problem of large-scale Jewish persecution at that time calling for such a plan. Jewish persecution in its intense form is a phenomenon of postwar developments. The concept of nationality was coming very much to the fore, and in the subsequent Peace Treaty led to the recasting of the political map of Europe. The Jews were considered a people who had been expatriated from their own homeland and scattered over the world. In that sense they were a homeless people, and historic justice demanded a policy of their return to the ancient homeland. That land was at the time under the domination of an enemy power, the Turkish Empire, from which every effort was being made to expel the Turk.
>
> The situation was therefore ripe for a declaration about the future of Palestine, and the Balfour Declaration emerged as a statement of policy whereby the Jews would be provided after the war with a national home in their historic homeland, from which they had been expelled by Romans and Turks in the course of the centuries. The Declaration in its very essence aimed at a long-range national plan for the future.

I think that deals with the point raised by Mr. Jacques so far as the question of sovereignty in Palestine is concerned. The Balfour Declaration was merely a statement of policy, and it was contingent upon its being sanctioned by the sovereign power after the end of the war. At the time of the Treaty of Versailles this sovereign was the allied and associated powers which took care of the disposition of the conquests from World War I, and under whose auspices at the Treaty of Versailles the mandatory system was produced. They stated that the League of Nations should be the body exercising sovereignty in Palestine by reason of the fact that the mandatary was made responsible and had to report every year on his trust to the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations.

As I say, it was not an arbitrary action on the part of Great Britain, which is the point you raise, of disposing of Palestine by the Balfour Declaration. It was not disposed of by that declaration but by international authority which placed Great Britain there as a mandatory.

Mr. JAQUES: You will admit that the terms of the Balfour Declaration of 1917 are one thing; and you will admit that the present claims of the Zionists to-day are something different.

Mr. MOWAT: No, I do not admit that. What I do admit is that a Jewish state was not promised in the terms of the Balfour Declaration. I do admit that. But I wish to assert that the framers of the Balfour Declaration told the Jewish people, when they assumed the mandate, that the national home was of the status of a minority, the Jewish community in Palestine, and that if the Jews took advantage of the opportunity offered to them to colonize Palestine, in the words of Lloyd George, then Palestine would become a Jewish state.

Mr. FLEMING: Did you say "could become"?

Mr. MOWAT: No, I said "would" become a Jewish state; and Mr. Balfour said the same thing in his statement that the Jewish state could not be immediately set up in Palestine, but was something to be developed by a process of political evolution.

Mr. JAQUES: In other words, they said one thing and meant another.

Mr. MOWAT: No, they brought out the national home status, as distinguished from the status of the Jewish community as it existed before the war as a "bridge status" to a Jewish state which would be possible when and if a Jewish majority was achieved in Palestine; when that community was still in a minority status under the mandate it would permit a national home; but the word "national" is of great significance there because it is a recognition of the craving need of the Jewish communities throughout the world for a national status of its own. In that regard I would like to supplement what has been said in regard to nationality by mentioning the definition of the Jewish state which the Zionists themselves, through their most representative men, have submitted before the Anglo-American Commission. Professor Brodetzky, chairman of the Board of Deputies in Britain, testified before the committee during its December sittings and the question was raised: when excessive nationalism has made the world bankrupt, what is your justification for setting up another national status for people like the Jews? You will simply be compounding the position we are already in? And his answer to that was this. In reply, The British Zionist leader said:—

> The essence of a Jewish state is: wherever Jews are now, their position is determined by others. They wish to live in a country where their civilization, their status, and similar matters are determined by them. Our conception of a state is not that Jews should become a power, but that they should live freely with their traditions and not have a minority status.

Liberation from the ubiquitous minority status of the Jews throughout the world implied or pledged in the Balfour Declaration. If it meant liberation to Jews in countries of persecution from the penalties of the minority status, then the Balfour status meant something. If it did not mean that, it meant very little to the Jewish community.

Mr. JAQUES: Just what is the status of a Jew in any country? For instance, take a Jew in Canada, is he a Jew or a Canadian or what?

Mr. MOWAT: Mr. Garber will answer that question.

Mr. GARBER: Mr. Jaques, I would like to explain the question by drawing suggestions between country and country. Take the British Empire, or a member of the British Empire. They do not visualize any Jewish problem in the national sense. There might be problems of individual adjustment; there might be slight acts of irritation when a Jew cannot get into a certain hotel and things of that sort; but in the political sense, Jews are not complaining, nor are they here to make any plea on behalf of the Jews of Canada.

Mr. ...t take a country such as Poland or most of the countries of Europe, or Germany, since the defeat of Hitler; take some countries of Europe where apparently the Jews are well treated; there is no guarantee that in twenty-five years' time the situation may not be completely changed because, in all those countries, the Jews are not in control of the legislative machinery. As Mr. Mowat has said: they did hope there would be one small spot where the Jews could make their own laws with due regard to the rights of a minority, or under the protection of the League to see that the Jews themselves did not abuse their rights as a majority. But at least in Palestine they would be a majority, and if it were not for that hope, the Jews would never have accepted the terms of the Balfour Declaration or mandate and put that tremendous machinery into action and spent that vast sum of money and energy to build that country with no intention that it be left in the hands of an Arab majority. Look at what happens to the Jews in some of the Arab lands?

Mr. JAQUES: May I say for the benefit of those who are not members of the committee, that I am a very strong nationalist myself and I have every sympathy with the Jew or with anybody else who believes in nationhood. I am anxious to preserve the national homes of all people from international control. My only doubt is as to the propriety of setting up a home in a country which, for the last 1,300 years, has been the home of other people who, apparently, are not willing to surrender their sovereign rights in that country. I may also say that I am an Englishman by birth and I feel very very keenly any departure from what I was brought up to believe: the sacredness of the word of the British government. I don't think there is any doubt, since the last war—I would not put a date on it—that the prestige of the word of the British government has deteriorated, and that is the reason for the deterioration of British prestige throughout most of the world.

Mr. BENIDICKSON: You mean since World War I?

Mr. JAQUES: Yes, I would say so. When I was in England two years ago, I discussed these questions with some of the members of parliament over there and they actually admitted it—I won't mention the names publicly, but I am willing to give them privately.

Mr. FLEMING: Are we confined now to questions or to statements? If we are going to have questions, very well. Mr. Jaques has the floor, but if it is a matter of statement, I would not want a statement such as Mr. Jaques has just made—that British prestige has deteriorated throughout the world, or that the sacredness of the word of the British government has deteriorated—to be passed unchallenged.

The CHAIRMAN: On Mr. Fleming's point I would say that Mr. Jaques should give the name of the member of parliament who made that statement, otherwise we should not have it in the record.

Mr. JAQUES: I will make it on my own responsibility then. I think it is pretty obvious that the prestige of the British government has deteriorated, and as I said in parliament last December, Palestine is one of the graveyards of that prestige. Is this a fair statement?

Mr. GARBER: Quite so; and I think that if the British government were to redeem its pledge to the Jews in Palestine, its international prestige would be brought back to its former undisputed position.

Mr. JAQUES: In 1915 the British government, or the British Commonwealth of Nations if you prefer it, found themselves threatened by German-led Turkish forces in Palestine with respect to the Suez Canal for one thing, and they sent Lawrence and some others.

Mr. LEGER: I believe this is a repetition of what was said on Friday. I do not think we should have a presentation like that. A good many of us want to ask questions. To ask questions is the right of every one of us.

Mr. JAQUES: This whole question of Palestine is not one to be treated lightly. What I was trying to say was: that when Great Britain or the British Commonwealth of Nations found themselves threatened by German-led Turkish forces in Palestine. which threatened the Suez Canal, Sir Henry McMahon made overtures to the Arab leaders that if the Arab leaders would bring in their Arab forces and join the British against the Turks, then the British would guarantee Arab independence. Now, I think that is a pretty fair statement; but at the same time, or perhaps shortly afterwards, owing to the damage by German submarines, there were certain key materials which were absolutely necessary to the making of munitions which were cut off from Great Britain. Mr. Lloyd George as Minister of Munitions, was faced with a crisis. Then Dr. Chaim Weizmann, who was a great chemist, solved that problem by producing synthetically, the basic key material which was essential to the manufacture of explosives. Mr. Lloyd George asked Dr. Chaim Weizmann in what way he could reward him? And Dr. Weizmann said: "I want nothing for myself, but I would like Palestine for the Jews." That is roughly what took place. Would you say that that is a fair statement?

Mr. MOWAT: You ask me if I think that the Arab contribution to the winning of the war deserved more generous treatment than it got?

Mr. JAQUES: I do not think that is the point.

Mr. MOWAT: You are stressing the value of the Arab contribution to the war in that they helped to destroy the Turks.

Mr. JAQUES: No, I stressed the value of the promise given before that; if the Arabs joined and helped the British, then they would be guaranteed their sovereign independence which included what then was a part of the Arab territory which certainly would include Palestine.

Mr. MOWAT: I have already made the point of the British governments attitude in regard to Palestine. We do not admit—and I agree with the government in this—that any promise was made of handing over Palestine to the Arabs when the war was finished. The legal position of the British government on that is well stated. But as to the Arab contribution towards the winning of the war being worth more than the $55,000,000 in gold which was paid to them by the British government—they were paid to fight for their own freedom. Sir Philip Grave states:—

> "The Land of Three Faiths" London, 1923, pp 112-113:....but the Palastinians (Arabs) confined themselves to deserting in large numbers to the British, who fed and clothed and paid for the maintenance of many thousand such prisoners of war, few indeed of whom could be induced to obtain their liberty by serving in the Sherifian Army.

And T. E. Lawrence on the tribesmen:—

> T. E. Lawrence, Seven Pillars of Wisdom, pp. 103-104: Fighting qualities of the tribesmen from the Hejaz and Transjordan. "Blood fueds were nominally healed....All the same, the members of one tribe were shy of those of another, and within the tribe no man would quite trust his neighbour. Each might be, usually was, whole-hearted against the Turk, but perhaps not quite to the point of failing to work off a family grudge upon a family enemy in the field. Consequently they could not attack. One company of Turks firmly entrenched in open country could have defied the entire army of them; and a pitched defeat with its casualties, would have ended the war by sheer horror.

That is the estimate of two outstanding men who knew what they were talking about as to the value of Arab military contribution towards the emancipation of those Arab lands which fell within the boundaries of the Ottoman Empire in World War I. As far as the British promises are con-

cerned, I have stated opinions in regard to them, and, I submit, as to whether the Arabs were treated generously on the basis of the co-operation they provided to win World War I in the Middle East, and I have quoted authorities on the subject. I leave that to the consideration of the committee.

Mr. JAQUES: There is no question of judging, afterwards, the value of the Arab contribution. If it was useless, then I do not know why Lawrence of Arabia was offered such high honours for helping to lead them in the war. The point comes to this, really, that afterwards the claim of Dr. Weizmann for having solved this chemical puzzle was given priority to the promises given to the Arabs for helping to expel the Turks from Palestine.

Mr. GARBER: May I say, Mr. Chairman, that this story of Dr. Weizmann is a true story; but it would be simplifying matters too much if we were led to believe that that alone was responsible for the issuance of the Balfour Declaration. We all know the whole story. First of all, there was an age old association between the British people and the Jewish people through the Bible. Balfour and the people who surrounded him were great students of the Bible and they thought this would be an historic opportunity for Britain to do something on a grand scale for the people of the Book. Secondly, we come to the British practical sense which seems to have led Britain into helping the Arabs.

In 1916 and 1917 Britain wanted to get help wherever she could and she did want to enlist the support of world Jewry on her side. The United States was still neutral and there was a powerful Jewry there, a lot of whom were of German stock. There was great pro-German sentiment in the United States which the British were anxious to swing over to our side. But the most fundamental reason for the Balfour Declaration was this: that Britain was afraid for her position in the Middle East. She knew that eventually these Arab lands would become independent. The Arabs having nothing to complain about because they have obtained independence in six or seven different countries, Palestine excluded. The British did want to establish in that strategic spot a strong Jewish community which would be grateful to Britain and act to guard the life-line of the Empire. The Jews readily agreed to it. A great many of the Jewish people were English speaking and they wanted to take advantage of this opportunity to form a partnership with Great Britain in Palestine. That was their primary response to the Balfour Declaration. As far as the Jewish people were concerned, if the pledge of partnership were lived up to, Britain would have her strongest ally at a point where she needs an ally.

Mr. JAQUES: In the White Paper of 1939 there is a very important point that has been denounced by Zionists. Malcolm MacDonald, who was then colonial secretary, called both the Zionists and the Arab representatives together in London, in the Spring of 1939. and having digested the viewpoint of both sides. he issued the well known White Paper of 1939 which was not favoured by the Arabs and was very strongly objected to by the Zionists who have been endeavouring to get it abrogated by Great Britain ever since. I think you denounced the White Paper of 1939 on Friday. Could you tell us on what grounds you did denounce?

Mr. MOWAT: Because it is not authoritative in international law. The Balfour Declaration is part of the international law of the world; but the White Paper of 1939 is a uni-lateral Act of the British government and it can be cancelled by international authority. If Great Britain sees fit to act on the recommendation of the Anglo-American committee to-day, that is Great Britain's responsibility; but the White Paper was thrown out by the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations as a violation of international law. General Smuts has agreed it is involved and it is subject to cancellation legally by an international authority.

Mr. JAQUES: Did you say that there was established a valid international law?

Mr. MOWAT: Yes, through the League of Nations.

Mr. KNOWLES: I have a question I would like to have discussed, Mr. Jaques.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like, after Mr. Jaques is through, for Mr. Leger to have the floor and to ask the next question.

Mr. JAQUES: I have only a few more questions.

Mr. LEGER: We have given Mr. Jaques fifty-five minutes of our time.

The CHAIRMAN: This is a committee of the House of Commons and we must give all the leeway possible to all the members of the committee.

Mr. JAQUES: There is another question. Should it come to war with the Arabs, and it looks as though it might, who would fight the war on the side of the Zionists, who would help to expel the Arabs?

Mr. MOWAT: There is no question of expelling the Arabs. They are welcome in Palestine. There are half a million more now than there were when the Balfour Declaration was implemented. Such a war would be fought in the whole of the Middle East, if these Palestinian Arabs fight. But if the Arab world fights—

Mr. JAQUES: Have they resisted the Zionists claims?

Mr. MOWAT: I think the Jewish Resistance Group in Palestine will take care of the situation.

Mr. JAQUES: You think that is right?

Mr. MOWAT: I thinks that is right, yes. They have offered to do so. When the G.O.C. of the Middle East Command testified before the committee in Jerusalem, he stated that if the British were to withdraw from Palestine, the Jewish Resistance force there was well disciplined, well armed, and well trained in the technique of fighting a modern war, something which the Arabs are not, because they did not fight in any numbers in this last war; and that the Hagana could take care of the defence of Palestine. He said he was not persuaded that the whole Arab world, even with its 33,000,000 in the middle East, Iraq, Lebanon, Syria, and Saudi Arabia, would rise in sufficient strength to give the Hagana much trouble. That is what the G.O.C. of the Middle East, and General Officer commanding the British troops in Palestine, testified before the committee.

(Authority Mr. Bartley Crum, member of the American section of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine.)

Mr. JAQUES: Who supplied the arms, Is such a Jewish army in Palestine legal, nationally or internationally?

Mr. MOWAT: 15,000 rifles were supplied by the British during the war at a critical period when the Arab world was very hostile to allied and British interests, and when the Mufti from Berlin, was exorting an Arab revolution in the Middle East. The British gave 15,000 rifles and machine guns to the Hagana, for the defence force which was not serving outside of Palestine. That accounts for the 15,000 rifles. That is a statement on the British military crisis in the Middle East about what was contributed in arms to Hagana as a means of stabilizing the British military situation in the Middle East during the most critical days of World War II.

Mr. JAQUES: But the army has not national or international status.

Mr. MOWAT: It was a very present help to the British in a time of trouble. For them to try to disarm the Hagana now is something that the Anglo-American committee would not agree to, based on the protection or lack of protection of the public, or lack of public security, during the period of the mandate. The

decision of the Anglo-American committee was that to disarm the defence force of the Jews in Palestine would not be just.

Mr. JAQUES: Has your organization anything to do with the new Zionist organization of America?

Mr. GARBER: No, absolutely not. They are not affiliated with the World Zionist Organization.

Mr. JAQUES: Have you taken any steps, any effective steps?

Mr. GARBER: To repudiate them? They have been repudiated in the metropolitan press of New York many times. Their delegates are not admitted to the congress of the Zionist organizations of the world.

Mr. LOW: Do you know Colonel Morris J. Mendellson?

Mr. GARBER: He is one of those.

Mr. LOW: How strong is this organization?

Mr. GARBER: We think it is merely an organization that exists on paper and backed particularly by some non-Jewish isolationists and notorious anti-British politicians in the United States, men like Senator Edmund Johnson and some others who have always been anti-British, and they are merely jumping on this band wagon.

Mr. LOW: You have seen this advertisement that appeared in the New York *Post* on Tuesday, April 16?

Mr. GARBER: Unfortunately it also contains a statement of one Canadian, and he is certainly repudiated by our organization.

Mr. FLEMING: Who is that?

Mr. GARBER: A Montreal lawyer, unfortunately. We have had him at our round tables many times to try to reason and argue with him, but he is notoriously obstinate.

Mr. KNOWLES: Put it down for being a lawyer.

Mr. GARBER: This is a democracy and one cannot do anything with the man.

Mr. FLEMING: Is there any reason why his name should not go on the record?

Mr. JAQUES: The newspaper *P.M.* was mentioned on Friday as endorsing your policy. I was going to ask if you were aware of the polictical leanings of *P.M.*?

Mr. GARBER: I do not really know but I understand it is very much to the left of centre.

Mr. JAQUES: It is Communistic, in other words.

Mr. GARBER: It is a millionaire's privilege, I suppose.

Mr. JAQUES: It is a Communistic paper. There is no doubt about that.

The CHAIRMAN: If Mr. Jaques is finished Mr. Leger will be the next one to ask questions. Before we proceed I believe that the members will approve my calling on Mr. Heaps before we adjourn this meeting. As most you know Mr. Heaps is an old parliamentarian and has made his mark in the House of Commons. I believe he will have something to contribute to the persent discussion. I will now call upon Mr. Leger.

Mr. LEGER: I want to clarify the stand I took when the question arose as to whether we should hear the Zionists. I opposed hearing the Zionist association because the order of reference did not permit us to do so. The order of reference given us was to go over the estimates of the Department of External Affairs. I now want to ask a few questions. I shall ask Mr. Garber and Mr. Mowat to be brief and to the point. I shall do the same. Who is in charge of the government in Palestine at the present time?

Mr. MOWAT: His Majesty's government in London is in charge of the government in Palestine through a high commissioner's administration headed by General Cunningham.

Mr. LEGER: Are there any Arabs or Jews in the present government?

Mr. MOWAT: Only in the lower grades of the civil service.

Mr. LEGER: To whom do you attribute the disturbances in Palestine at the present time?

Mr. MOWAT: Two groups. There are two terrorist groups operating in Palestine. There is a group known as the Urgin and another group known as the Stern gang.

Mr. LEGER: Are they Arabs?

Mr. MOWAT: They are Jews who are using terrorism as a weapon against the policy of the mandatory which they oppose and which they say needs to be resisted by violence.

Mr. LEGER: Are they Zionists?

Mr. MOWAT: They are not members of the Zionist group that is represented in the Jewish agency.

Mr. LEGER: What are their reasons for creating such disturbances?

Mr. MOWAT: The degradation of Jewish citizenship by the mandatory in Palestine. I will illustrate that by mentioning what was told me at an Institute of International Affairs session by a Canadian major who spent the winter of 1944-45 at Benevento in Italy with the Canadian infantry. He said, "I knew two Palestinian Jewish officers with whom I shared a collapsible bath during four months in the winter." They often discussed the white paper. They said they were submitting to that policy without act of protest during the war but when it was over they would protest. They would return to Palestine and take up resistance. If they wanted to buy land on which to settle they were confined to 5 per cent of the area of Palestine; 95 per cent of the area of Palestine was closed to them as an area in which they had the right of land purchase. That is due to one of the clauses in the white paper. If they wanted to bring some of their realtives from Europe, whom they hoped might survive, to Palestine to start life anew the mandatory said that they might not bring them in but an Arab neighbour who had not fought for freedom in this war, and who might have been a Quisling, might send to Iraq or Egypt or Syria and bring in any relative of his without reference to a quota, and he had the right to buy land in any part of Palestine by the authority of the mandatory. In other words, the Arab who had not fought in this war was a first class citizen of Palestine while the Jew who had fought for freedom in this war against the dictators was a second class citizen of Palestine. They said they would resist that, possibly violently.

In addition to that you have a third group, the Haganah, a passive resistance group which has used diversionary tactics in order to get entrance legally, as they say, under the Balfour Declaration policy, of Jewish people into Palestine.

Mr. LEGER: Who are they?

Mr. MOWAT: Practically the whole of the Jewish population in Palestine is directly related to what they call their resistance force, but they are quite different from the terrorist groups, which are a very small group in Palestine.

Mr. LEGER: Has the British parliament promised the admission of 100,000 Jews into Palestine?

Mr. MOWAT: Have they promised it?

Mr. LEGER: Yes.

Mr. MOWAT: No, they have not.

Mr. LEGER: Can you tell the committee if there are any Jews seeking entrance into Palestine without first obtaining permits or papers enabling them to do so? If so, why?

Mr. GARBER: They definitely do because the government operates under a quota of 1,500 a month.

Mr. BENIDICKSON: 1,500?

Mr. GARBER: Yes, and the people in Europe are so desperate they try to get to Palestine the best way they can. They charter boats, and they get in.

Mr. LEGER: Is it so that prior to the Jews coming to Palestine there was no irrigation system?

Mr. GARBER: The land was absolutely desolate in 1917.

Mr. LEGER: Have the Jews established an irrigation system and caused non-productive land to produce?

Mr. MOWAT: A very large proportion of the land which the Jews have settled in Palestine is land which has been drained and converted to agriculture.

Mr. LEGER: In other words, it was arid land?

Mr. MOWAT: It was arid land which was not occupied by the Arabs, and they considered this land to be useless.

Mr. LEGER: Now it is producing heavy crops?

Mr. MOWAT: Now it is producing abundantly.

Mr. LEGER: Do the Jews and Arabs seem to assimilate?

Mr. MOWAT: One of the encouraging things about the past few months has been reports of correspondents which have come to the press on this side of the Atlantic stating that tension seems to be on the higher political level, and that most of the people are neighbourly and seem to get on very well together.

Mr. LEGER: Are there any Arabs working for Jews?

Mr. MOWAT: Oh yes, a great many.

Mr. LEGER: Do the Jews pay the Arabs well?

Mr. MOWAT: Can you document that, Mr. Garber? They have a tariff for Arab labour.

Mr. GARBER: There is a very authoritative book published recently. I referred to it the other day. It is called, "Palestine, Land of Promise".

Mr. LEGER: I am only asking a question.

Mr. GARBER: I want to quote from it.

> The daily wage paid to a non-skilled Arab labourer in Palestine is 100 to 180 mils while a skilled worker gets from 250 to 600 mils a day. In Syria the wage ranges from 67 mils in the older industries to 124 mils in the newer ones.

Mr. LOW: What is a mil?

Mr. GARBER: I guess it is a unit of currency.

> A factory labourer in Iraq is paid from 40 to 60 mils. A mil is one-quarter of a cent at the current rate of exchange.

Mr. LEGER: Has the standard of living been better since the Jews have established there?

Mr. GARBER: Decidedly.

Mr. MOWAT: That is mentioned repeatedly by people who travel in Palestine, that the Palestinian Arab is the best off Arab in the whole of the Middle East. He is so well off that the Arab population of Palestine has increased enormously and is the only place in the Middle East where an enormous increase has taken place. That is due to the attractiveness of life in Palestine under the influence of the Jewish national home project.

Mr. LEGER: Will the Zionists admit that Great Britain and the English speaking world have been the very greatest friend?

Mr. MOWAT: Pardon?

Mr. LEGER: The very greatest friend?

Mr. MOWAT: Mr. Garber can answer that question. It is the opinion of myself and all those interested in this problem that the greatest friend the Jewish race has ever had, or still has, fundamentally is Great Britain and the British people. That is why we are so anxious to make good on the Balfour Declaration policy which we regard as an engagement with a people with whom we have a unique association in history.

Mr. FRASER: There was a motion picture shown in the theatres across Canada within the last two months as to irrigation in Palestine. Do you remember what the name of that picture was?

Mr. MOWAT: I do not remember that—it was a March of Time.

Mr. FRASER: That was it. That was a wonderful picture. It was worth while.

Mr. LEGER: I saw it.

The CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed I want to say a few words on the point raised by Mr. Leger. I know that he does it with the idea that the External Affairs committee should be a going concern. It is true our order of references as given to us at this session was the estimates of the Department of External Affairs. That was a departure from the ordinary procedure. It was the first time that the estimates of a department were given to a committee to deal with. In fact, it has been fought against in the House of Commons on several occasions. For instance, members have objected that finances will come before the committee when the different items are discussed. I should like to say that the order of reference is much wider than what we had last year because every time we wanted to deal with something new we had to ask for a new order of reference. It was very unwieldy as far as our committee was concerned.

The moment we began to deal with these items we found wonderful co-operation from every official of the Department of External Affairs, but we were also confronted with this fact that due to their ramifications we had to call in some officials of other departments. For instance, we had to call Mr. Jolliffe of the Department of Immigration. Later on we had to call Mr. Morse, Secretary of the United Nations Society. I believe it was time well spent. At the meeting at which Mr. Morse, addressed questions were asked.

> I believe the fact that our committee allowed the Zionist movement to come before us has been vindicated by the questions that have already been asked of the people who appeared before us last Friday. I believe that our committee will be working properly, if, as far as I am personally concerned, it functions fully in dealing with matters in which international interests are involved. I appreciate the comment Mr. Leger has made on that score and the questions that he and previous members of the committee have asked from the people who have appeared before us.

Mr. LEGER: I believe you agree with me that the order of reference does not permit us to make any report regarding the Zionist or the Arab question to the House of Commons. The only thing which will happen will be that the papers will have the privilege of publishing it.

Mr. LOW: That is all it is.

Mr. LEGER: We have no right to do anything.

The CHAIRMAN: I must say by way of clarification that I stated last Friday to the witnesses who were here at the time we had no power of recommendation. To protect the security and activities of the members of our committee I had a personal interview with the Minister of Justice once the request was made to our committee by the Zionists to come before us. I wanted to be absolutely sure I was on safe ground. Personally I also felt very strongly they should be allowed to come here and voice their sentiments so that it would arouse public opinion and there would be more enlightenment on this very important question.

Mr. KNOWLES: May I ask one question? I believe you want to call Mr. Heaps. I should like to hear him.

The CHAIRMAN: We are still open for questions.

Mr. KNOWLES: My question is this. While recognizing the relevance and the importance of the Balfour Declaration and the whole past history of this question is not the immediate matter, and the one we should be directing our attention to so as to be of some help, that of the recommendation of the Anglo-American Commission that 100,000 Jews be permitted to go to Palestine right away? Is it not true by all this other discussion we are not facing the issue and are defeating the purpose some of us had in wanting the matter discussed?

Mr. LOW: I would suggest that all these things that are relevant must be discussed and must be brought before the public in order that they can properly assess whether or not this is the time to bring in 100,000 Jews. If by making the decision to bring them in you are going to throw the world into a war that our boys and girls will have to get into I tell you it becomes a very serious matter.

Mr. FLEMING: If Mr. Knowles has completed his question I should like to follow that with a question which I think shows clearly the relevance of this review. I should like to ask Mr. Garber and Mr. Mowat if the aspirations of those they represent at the present time do not go beyond mere sanctuary for Jews who are displaced persons in every part of the world and still look to Palestine where they hope to build a Jewish national home in the sense that would be a Jewish political state? That is correct, is it not?

Mr. GARBER: Yes.

Mr. FLEMING: So that the Balfour Declaration and the action of the League of Nations in mandating Palestine to Great Britain have a direct bearing on the question of the selection of a Jewish national home quite apart from any question of providing sanctuary at the present time for displaced persons. The next question is this. The aspirations of those who are represented are that the whole of Palestine—that is the present political state of Palestine—is to be embraced within the area within which the Jewish national home is to be founded?

Mr. GARBER: 10,000 square miles. The original Palestine was larger because it also had a much larger area across the Jordan but that was taken away in 1922.

Mr. FLEMING: Let us go back and clarify the question which has been raised from time to time about the partition of Palestine. There have been some suggestions recently about a further partition of Palestine as perhaps a contribution to the settlement of the present difficulties.

Mr. KNOWLES: It is in this morning's paper.

Mr. FLEMING: And in some of last week's, too. What is the official view of those represented by the witnesses this morning on that question.

Mr. GARBER: It is quite likely in order to get out of this terrific impasse—everybody is tired of the issue—that Zionists throughout the world may say,

"Well, let us call it a day. We will have a smaller area and we will build more intensively in the smaller area."

Mr. FLEMING: But the legal claim is, as things stand, to the creation of a Jewish national home in the light of what remains of Palestine?

Mr. GARBER: You know we might have difficulty with extreme groups. Sometimes a moderate party is forced not to say "yes" to a proposition but rather to wait until it is sanctioned by some law and not be asked to say "yes" because there is pressure of other groups. Then they might call us traitors, and all sorts of things.

Mr. FLEMING: Has Mr. Garber any figures on the number entering Palestine now in the course of what is commonly called illegal immigration but which is justified by Mr. Garber and Mr. Mowat on the strength of the Balfour Declaration?

Mr. GARBER: It is a little more than the 1,500 a month we are entitled to but not very much more. We are watched by the whole British fleet and air force.

Mr. WINKLER: I should like to ask Mr. Garber a question. Is there any estimate of the number of homeless Jews at the end of the first world war as compared to the estimate of Jews who are homeless after this war?

Mr. GARBER: There were comparatively few homeless Jews at the end of the first world war.

Mr. WINKLER: They would be largely confined to Poland?

Mr. GARBER: They were driven out by Hitler and transplanted from one country to another, so that to-day there are only a million and a quarter Jews in Europe. The Jews in Belgium, France and Holland are not homeless but about 600,000 are uprooted completely; 400,000 or 500,000 are in the camps for displaced persons.

Mr. KNOWLES: May I proceed a little further on the line which I started a moment ago? It apparently drew a bit of fire. I am sorry but I will have to make a three-sentence statement first. At one stage of the game the Zionist movement and world Jewry generally felt it would not be satisfied with anything less than the implementation of the Balfour Declaration in full, as Mr. Fleming has outlined it. Then there came a time when the Anglo-American committee made its report and both sides were dissatisfied. It did not take any intelligence on the part of any of us to realize that would be the case. The Arabs were certainly opposed to it and the Jews were opposed to it, but is it not true that the way the situation has developed, with deterioration and all the rest of it, that it has now reached the point where the issue is that 100,000?

Mr. GARBER: The main issue.

Mr. KNOWLES: And while there might be other things to settle afterwards it would be an immediate settlement of the disturbances and of all the feeling of having been let down that exists if the 100,000 were permitted in?

Mr. GARBER: It would ease the political tension considerably and give relief to 100,000 desperate people.

Mr. LOW: If it can be done peacefully.

Mr. GARBER: Yes.

Mr. FLEMING: When Mr. Knowles says it is the main issue I think he means it is the main immediate issue. It does not solve the long term problem as to whether Palestine is to be the Jewish national state in a political sense. It is only the immediate issue.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you make a distinction between a national state and a political one?

Mr. FLEMING: I am trying to make it quite clear that over a period of years there has been a good deal of discussion revolving around the word "national" as it appeared in the Balfour Declaration because it was interpreted by world Jewry as involving the establishment of a Jewish political state in which sovereignty would be vested in the Jewish residents there. That has always raised this problem about the handing over of sovereignty. As we all know there have been long debates over the proper interpretation of that word "national" as it appeared in the Balfour Declaration. The only point I am making at the moment is that while the tension, as Mr. Garber has said, would be eased by the admission of the 100,000 displaced Jews from Europe to Palestine giving them a refuge there it still leaves unsolved this question of the creation of a national political state of Palestine.

Mr. GARBER: Except that some formula might be found by way of partition. I want to remind you that the whole issue of the Jewish state has really come to the fore only since 1942 as a result of a conference that took place at the Biltmore hotel in New York and which is referred to as the Biltmore program. Before that we did not stress the issue of the state too much because we are democratic enough to realize that we cannot expect an act creating a Jewish state while the Jews are still a minority of the population. We have always realized that first we have to become a majority, that is why we stress the importance of getting people in there, but before we are a majority we realize there will not be a Jewish state.

Mr. LEGER: What is the number of Arabs and Jews in Palestine?

Mr. GARBER: I would say 1,200,000 Arabs and 600,000 Jews.

Mr. MOWAT: It is referred to in the white paper that it should be in the permanent ratio of two Arabs to one Jew. I should like to add to what Mr. Garber has said that the attitude to world Jewry of the League of Nations and Great Britain and the mandate was this, that if you make good colonizing Palestine you have the opportunity to achieve statehood in Palestine. In other words, if you can earn in Palestine the status of a state by the way you colonize the country and develop it then it is yours to earn. They were faced with two possibilities. There were 55,000 Jews in Palestine in 1917. Suppose only 10,000 Jews had settled in Palestine between then and 1946. Suppose only 10,000 Jews had gone to Palestine. We would be in the position of saying to the Jews, "Look here, all these protestations of homelessness and the curse of homelessness are just so much wind. You have been vociferous for a national home, but you have had the opportunity to earn that and you have failed to qualify. Only 10,000 people have gone to Palestine out of the millions in the world that were suffering the terrors of homelessness, so we had better take Palestine and review the situation and put it to a purpose that will serve some human need because your need is not a need."

Just the opposite has taken place. The colonization of Palestine has been highly successful.

Mr. LOW: How many are there there?

Mr. MOWAT: 600,000 are there; 550,000 more Jews are in Palestine to-day than there were in 1917. They have shown the genius of relating themselves in a normal way to a balanced economy basic in agriculture. That is to their eternal credit when we consider the ghettoizing of Jews in urban communities and their disenfranchisement through the centuries in a way that did not permit them to be owners of property and therefore agriculturists.

They have had the most dynamic economy that was in operation between the two wars, and the most rapidly expanding population in the world in any similar or greater area. We are in the position of reviewing the Palestine situation and saying, "Good, you have made a tremendous success but we are going to

compromise the deal on it and cut you out. You are damned if you fail and you are damned if you succeed." This is a heads I win and tails you lose proposition as far as the Jews are concerned. They cannot win no matter what they do, no matter in what good faith they launched and carried out the enterprise of the development of their national home in Palestine in a way that was monumental and with credit to themselves throughout the Middle East. No Middle East economy has been no successful since the Babylonian days when Iraq, which to-day has a population of 3,800,000, sustained 30,000,000 people in the areas of the Tigris and the Euphrates.

These people have the magic touch. They can make this country thrive in abundance. They have been overwhelmingly successful. Because they have been, we are in a very weak position to go to them and say, "Because you have made good we are going to compromise the deal on which you have been working." It is a heads I win and tails you lose proposition for the Jew. The opportunity to achieve statehood in their national home in Palestine was an opportunity quite openly offered to them by the responsible leaders of the British government in the time of the Balfour Declaration and in the years immediately afterwards. The white paper said that a state was not precluded under the terms of the Balfour Declaration. As recently as the white paper of 1939 the statement was made that a Jewish state is not precluded under mandate or under the Balfour Declaration policy.

To come along and say now, "You are not going to have a state after the successful enterprises you have launched and tended to in Palestine" is scant justice to people who have gone there in good faith.

Mr. LEGER: Was the Balfour Declaration sanctioned by the League of Nations?

Mr. MOWAT: Yes.

Mr. JAQUES: Was it promised or implied that if the Jews made a commercial success in Palestine that Palestine would be their state? Was that implied or promised in any way at all in the Balfour Declaration?

Mr. MOWAT: Lloyd George, Mr. Winston Churchill—

Mr. JAQUES: It is something new to me.

Mr. MOWAT: Mr. Amery. I can give you the quotations. I can quote these men. They are on the line stating that a Jewish state is right within the range of possibility. Mr. Churchill said that if at some time in the future there should rise on the banks of the Jordan a Jewish state comprising 3,000,000 or 4,000,000 people something would have happened which would be, from the point of view of British interests, of great value.

That is approximately Mr. Churchill's statement.

Mr. JAQUES: Then the Balfour Declaration was just nonsense because it said one thing and meant something entirely different?

Mr. MOWAT: I am just giving you the interpretation that is placed on the Balfour Declaration policy by the leaders of the British government.

Mr. JAQUES: It said that nothing should be done.

Mr. MOWAT: I do not think anything has been done either.

Mr. JAQUES: Now, the witness tells us in 1917 it was said that if they make a commercial success in Palestine, they will be rewarded by being given a Jewish state. I have never heard that before this moment.

Mr. FRASER: At the last meeting we had on Friday it was brought out that Palestine could absorb 100,000 Jews and look after them. Now, to-day it is stated that the quota is 1,500 a month. How many can Palestine take in a month and look after?

Mr. MOWAT: They can distribute them and look after them among the 600,000 Jews in Palestine.

Mr. FRASER: No. They could not take in 100,000 in one shot in a month.

Mr. MOWAT: No.

Mr. FRASER: How long would it take?

Mr. MOWAT: By the end of 1946 they could absorb and take care of the whole 100,000.

The CHAIRMAN: What was the highest peak of population in Palestine history, that would be within the territory of the 10,000 square miles?

Mr. MOWAT: In the lifetime of our Lord, at the beginning of the Christian era, that area had between 2,000,000 and 3,000,000 people; but there were artificial systems of water distribution and irrigation in force at that time and the country was capable of supporting them. Lawrence went through there on a hiking tour in 1909 and this is what he wrote to his mother, giving his views of Palestine. He wrote to her at page 73 of his "Letters of Lawrence", edited by David Garnett:

> It is a comfort to know that the country was not a bit like this in the time of our Lord. The Renaissance painters were right, who drew Him and his disciples feasting in a pillared hall, or sunning themselves on marble staircases: everywhere one finds remains of splendid Roman roads and houses and public buildings, and Galilee was the most Romanized province of Palestine. Also the country was well peopled and well-watered artificially. There were not twenty miles of thistles behind Capernaum: and on the way round the lake they did not come on dirty dilapidated Bedouin tents, with people calling to them to come in and talk, while miserable curs came snapping at their heels: Palestine was a decent country then and could so easily be made so again. The sooner the Jews farm it all the better: their colonies are the bright spots in a desert.

That was what Lawrence of Arabia said in 1909.

Mr. GARBER: Lodermilk quotes an authority as saying that assumes the population at the time of Christ to have been 5,000,000, including Transjordan.

The CHAIRMAN: That would be a larger territory than Palestine to-day?

Mr. GARBER: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Larger than the 10,000 square miles of the new Palestine?

Mr. GARBER: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Have they got access to the sea?

Mr. GARBER: Yes, they have the coast, Haifa, Tel Aviv, and all those ports.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there a blood affinity between the Arabs and the Jews.

Mr. MOWAT: They have common Semitic origin.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fraser has asked me if it would be possible to have the publication of our reports increased. I sent word that Mr. Mowat had made arrangements last Friday at his own expense to have a special issue of 5,000 copies printed in English and 1,500 copies printed in French.

Mr. FRASER: Yes, I asked the question because I thought that members of parliament or other people interested could buy extra copies if such copies were printed.

Mr. KNOWLES: Would it not be true to say that the intense interest on the part of both Jews and Goya in getting 100,000 Jews into Palestine at the present time is due more to the suffering of the Jewish people in Europe than to the Zionist ideal?

Mr. FRASER: You mean the humanitarian side.

Mr. GARBER: Quite so.

Mr. KNOWLES: Would it not be true to say that before the days of persecution, world Jewry was not so closely knit in getting people into Palestine as it is now because of the humanitarian needs?

Mr. GARBER: We always had a small but wealthy class of Jews who did not co-operate and were, in fact, antagonistic, men like Rosenwald of Chicago; but the vast mass of Jewish people supported the Zionist movement.

Mr. KNOWLES: So the non-Jews who are not interested in the Zionist ideals should be interested in it upon humanitarian grounds?

Mr. GARBER: We have a partnership agreement.

Mr. KNOWLES: I am trying to put it on the ground of support.

Mr. GARBER: Before the persecution of Jews started, we had large immigration into Palestine; there were always 25,000 to 30,000 Jews going in there every year.

Mr. JACKMAN: Prior to the first Great War, were there many Jews in Palestine?

Mr. MOWAT: Prior to when?

Mr. JACKMAN: Prior to 1914?

Mr. MOWAT: It started from a community of 15,000 to 20,000. At the turn of the century there was a Zionist movement in course of development in the world; and in 1917 there were 55,000 Jews in Palestine.

Mr. JACKMAN: Have there always been Jews there throughout history?

Mr. MOWAT: Yes; there have always been Jewish communities in Palestine, although sometimes they were very small.

Mr. JACKMAN: Have you any idea how many Arabs were there in 1917?

Mr. MOWAT: About 600,000 Arabs were there in 1917. Sir Wyndham Deedes, the president of the British Organization for the Jewish National Home, who was one of the most brilliant intelligence officers of the British army in the Middle East, said that it appeared in 1870, prior to the Zionist development, that in Palestine there were 250,000 people of all races; 156,000 of whom were settled Moslems; and if that community in 1870 included 156,000 Moslems, at the normal increase, according to the natural increase of population, they should to-day number about 250,000 in 1946; so that the majority of the 1,200,000 of Palestine Arabs must be accounted for by means other than relating them to the 156,000 Moslems who were resident in Palestine in 1870. It is a significant thing that around 1880 Zionism started to plant these Jewish colonies in Palestine. The rapid development of Palestine took place to the point where the population numbered close to 700,000 in 1917. That population increase is something directly related to Zionism in Palestine during that period of Zionist enterprise.

Mr. JACKMAN: Until 1914 was this whole area under the Turks?

Mr. MOWAT: Yes, until 1914 the whole area was under the Turks; and the local chieftains acted in the capacity of representatives of the Ottoman's Imperial government, as tax gatherers.

Mr. JACKMAN: And those figures you gave us include Transjordan?

Mr. MOWAT: No, Transjordan itself has about three times that much area. There are 10,000 square miles of Palestine supporting some 1,800,000, and, on the density of the population of Belgium, it would support in the neighbourhood of 7,000,000.

Mr. GARBER: Transjordan is ten times as large with a population of only 300,000.

Mr. MOWAT: It is about 35,000 square miles in area.

Mr. GARBER: With a population of 250,000 to 300,000 people.

The CHAIRMAN: What is the present Christian population of Palestine including all denominations?

Mr. GARBER: About 165,000.

The CHAIRMAN: What was it after World War I?

Mr. GARBER: I do not imagine it has changed an awful lot.

Mr. JAQUES: Does that exclude the Christians?

The CHAIRMAN: No, I meant all Christians.

Mr. JACKMAN: Did the Arabs in their own territories mistreat the Jews?

Mr. GARBER: The Jews in Yemen have always been mistreated. That place is down near the Red Sea. I would say, in the main, they were probably not treated any worse by the Arabs than they were by a lot of non-Arabs in certain European lands.

Mr. JACKMAN: On Friday some one asked the question whether or not there was any real difficulty between men of the Jewish population in Palestine and men of the Arab population. The answer was that they got along very well together, and that it was the hierarchy of the Arabs that seemed to stir them up to antagonism. How does that work out in these Arab countries where it is the Arab himself who holds sway?

Mr. GARBER: It varies. For instance, in some parts of Africa the Jews are degraded and still have to live in ghettos. In general their civilization and economy is so low that it does not count for anything. But I would say that socially they do get along well. They speak the same language. They all speak Arabic.

Mr. JACKMAN: Would you say that since the Belfour Declaration there have been as many Arabs as Jews immigrating to Palestine?

Mr. GARBER: More.

Mr. JACKMAN: More have come in since then?

Mr. GARBER: Yes.

Mr. JACKMAN: May I ask with respect to the 100,000, which is an arbitrary figure and based upon humanitarian grounds as much as upon any other grounds, if that figure were achieved, it would by no means solve the problem of distressed Jews in Europe, and it would only lead to their asking for permission for a larger Jewish immigration into Palestine. What significance can be attached to the 100,000 figure?

Mr. GARBER: We take it that the 100,000 are the neediest cases and that once you relieve that pressure, it does ease the position of the others and something can be done. Let us not forget that the committee in its report also urged that other countries take in some of these people, these displaced persons, both Jews and non-Jews.

Mr. JACKMAN: We have in the Balfour Declaration the statement that there should be a Jewish national home. I think you said yourself a little while ago that the only way to have a Jewish sovereignty in the country was to have a majority of the population and thereby allow the ordinary democratic processes go to to work. What protection is there under the League of Nations mandate or any other existing fundamental document at the present time which would ensure the Arabs, if they should be in a minority, or the Jews if they should be in the minority, their constitutional rights as free citizens of the world and the right of Palestine to control all the area to be turned over to the residents in Palestine? What protection have you for the minority whether it be Jewish or Arab?

Mr. GARBER: I would say that we would reach a population where the statehood would be declared and the nations would have set up something like the B.N.A.

Mr. KNOWLES: Heaven forbid

Mr. MOWAT: I would say that it would be done by a body like the United Nations, when civilian rights would be guaranteed to Jews and Arabs by treaty. Statehood would be something that the country would be accountable for to the sovereign international authority. That is what we understand by sovereign statehood for Palestine. But it is a concept which it may be necessary to realize in the world of the future. In so far as organizing the world into communities where minority rights are protected is concerned, there is very little chance in a state like Palestine, which is surrounded on every side by Arab states, that anything arbitrary would be done by any government in Palestine that would hurt the citizenship of Arabs. Arab lands touch every boundary of Palestine and the accountability of the state itself would be bound by treaty. The only Arab citizenship would be a first class citizenship.

Mr. JACKMAN: That concept is one which is thoroughly understood by Jews as well as by the Zionist organizations?

Mr. MOWAT: Oh, yes, I would not be associated with this movement unless that were thoroughly understood.

The CHAIRMAN: You are perfectly at liberty to state that, since Palestine is the birthplace of Christianity.

Mr. MOWAT: Yes; and as a Christian I certainly insist that Christians have equal rights with every other group in Palestine. I feel that to be what is in view through the effect of the development of the Jewish national home. The turning of it into a Jewish state is not beyond the bounds of possibility from the Christian point of view and it would be in the highest humanitarian interests because it would normalize the life of these people to whom the Balfour Declaration was addressed, the Jewish people. It would normalize their lives in giving them a land base to which they could look as the centre of inspiration; it would maintain intact, for the future, their culture and traditions; and it would be a very present help in trouble if it were a place where they could go as of right. That point was brought home to me by a man who was the best man at my wedding. He went to Japan to teach in the Canadian Academy. He taught there for years until 1937 when the atmosphere in Japan was so hot and anti-foreign that he took counsel with himself and said: "I must get out of here before the storm breaks." So he came back to Canada with his family.

Now, supposing that man had no citizenship in Canada; where could he have gone as of right? Supposing every country in the world was closed to him and he had no place of his own to go as of right? Supposing he had been only enjoying what is known as second class citizenship in Japan his state would have been something we would not like to share with our families. In countries where they were minorities the Jews for centuries have been in the same position as he was in; but they have had to stay and face the music of discrimination, hatred, persecution and violence. Their traditional role is that of being on the receiving end of violence, of having violence administered to them and being able to offer none in return. Anybody with a knowledge of Jewish culture knows that it was very pacific and that it counselled the Jews not to offer violence in exchange for violence. So what is taking place in Palestine to-day is something we witness with regret. Jews look upon it with hostility because it is a departure from their traditional policy; although understanding human nature, we can explain it on the basis of our own experiences under such circumstances.

Here in Palestine you have a land base for a homeland where a person in the position of these people may normalize his life and where he can say, "Civis Palestinius Sum"—I am a citizen of Palestine, if other countries are unable to give him citizenship under conditions that are endurable. If Palestine

becomes a national home for Jewish people it is a place for them as of right and not of sufferance. It offers the hallmarks of citizenship. If that position can be achieved, the position of the Jewish people can be normalized as a world community in a sense in which it cannot otherwise be normalized. With a national home or with a Jewish state, when conditions become unendurable to them in the countries in which they are living as a helpless minority, such as in Germany in the decade just preceding this one, they will have a place where they have a right to be, where they can enjoy the normal privileges of citizenship.

That is what interests me so much in these Palestine issues, the very need Jews have for such a place of their own where they can be Jews as of right, rather than as they are in other countries where they naturally have to adjust themselves to the prevailing culture. That is something that was inherent in the pledge of the Balfour Declaration and I believe that the admission of 100,000 or so, if that is worked out, and if the Jews throughout the world are normalized as are other people, such as the Danes, the Norwegians and the Swedes, by having a land base of their own, then the largest single contribution to the solution of the Jewish problem will be made by this coming into effect.

Mr. JAQUES: May I ask if the Jewish home which was originally promised has now become a Jewish state, what guarantee is there that the Jewish state in time will not become a Jewish empire starting with Transjordan, for instance?

Mr. MOWAT: The guarantee is that such matters are regulated by the United Nations authority.

Mr. JAQUES: What is the United Nations? Who is it?

Mr. MOWAT: Well, we belong to it, Canada belongs to it.

The CHAIRMAN: I believe the questions are pretty well exhausted and I believe the members of the committee are pretty well satisfied with the information they have received. I take pleasure in introducing to you now a man who is well known to you, Mr. A. A. Heaps. I believe Mr. Heaps has been one of the primary causes of getting Palestine oranges to us during the war.

Mr. HEAPS: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I might explain in the first instance how I come to be here this morning.

Mr. JAQUES: Do you mind standing up, Mr. Heaps?

Mr. HEAPS: I would prefer to sit down. Let me start all over again. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I might say how I come to be here this morning. I noticed in the press the other day that this committee was in session; and naturally being interested in the question, I telephoned to your chairman this morning and asked him when the committee was to meet. He told me it would meet this morning and I told him I would come down and listen to the deliberations of the committee on account of the great interest I have in the question under discussion. Then I was requested by your chairman, very kindly —although I do not know if it was very wisely—to say a few words on the question because he knew I had been to Palestine, had seen things there at first hand, and that, under the circumstances, I might be able to give a certain amount of information to the members of this committee which he hoped would be useful to them.

I might explain at the outset that I have never belonged to the Zionist organization. I do not say that with any feeling of boastfulness, but I state it as a matter of fact. The Zionist organization had no knowledge of my coming here this morning. I came here entirely on my own. I do not represent anyone. Anything I say here is entirely my own view on the question. Most of my information has been gathered at first hand on the spot.

Now, the question was raised here of the attitude of the Jews towards Great Britain. I shall speak as one who, like Mr. Jaques, myself was born and raised there; and who, like Mr. Jaques, decided to emigrate to this country at a later date. We both came here. We think that the British people, if there is such

a thing as the British people, or the Anglo-Saxons of Great Britain, have no greater friend or admirers in the world than the Jewish people, practically, in all parts of the world; and there has been no question about the loyalty of the Jews to Great Britain. And I do not think there can be any question about the loyalty of the Jew here in the Dominion of Canada.

The British people have so many remarkable things to their credit, that some things go quite unnoticed. For instance, at the present time, knowing as I do, at first hand experience, the hardships that they have gone through during the war, during the past six years, yet, at this very time, when the world is suffering, the British people in particular are suffering as a result of what they have gone through, with a shortage of practically every commodity.

When I visited Britain during the war, I experienced the scanty rations on which they have had to live. Even now the British people have decided to tighten their belts another inch or two in order to feed their enemies. It is because of that attitude, which indicates the very fine qualities of the people of Great Britain, that the actions of the moment in Palestine are almost inexplicable to many people.

I say there is a fine tradition in Great Britain. Then, with respect to the revolution that is taking place in Palestine against British rule and authority, we still have to bear in mind the thought that probably the most glorious pages in British history are those which deal with revolution in Great Britain, right from the time of Magna Carta down to the period of the Chartist movement, about 100 years ago. However, I want to say a few words about my own impressions of Palestine so that you may have, I hope, an impression of what conditions of life are like there. Some years ago I received an invitation from Jewish people in Palestine to visit their country and, naturally, when that invitation included my expenses, I could not resist the opportunity.

Mr. FRASER: May I interrupt you, Mr. Heaps, to ask what your business is now?

Mr. HEAPS: I am in the civil service at the moment, in the Department of Labour.

Mr. FRASER: I wanted that upon the record.

Mr. BENIDICKSON: You are a former member of the House of Commons?

Mr. HEAPS: Oh, yes. I have got some of my old colleagues around the table. When I received that invitation to go to Palestine I went there with as open mind as any person possibly could. I did not know what to expect or what I should see, a country that was more or less primitive in its character or almost nothing. My first impression of the country was when the ship landed at the port of Jaffa, if you can call it a port. The ship waited outside about a mile from the shore on account of the rocks. It could not get in closer. An old fashioned boat came to the ship. From the ship people were taken on to the mainland in small boats.

There came to me the assistant secretary of the citrus exchange. They took me off in the boat. They spoke perfect English. The first question I put to him was, "In what part of England did you learn your English", because he had an Oxford accent. He said, "I learned my English in Telaviv; I have never been out of the country."

I landed there and I had an opportunity to try to understand the people and their problems, because I met the leading Jewish organizations; I met Arabs. I met Arab workmen; I met Jewish workmen. I was taken in hand by the citrus exchange for a part of the time and for another part of the time I was in the hands of what is called the Histadruth which is the Hebrew term for the Jewish trade union in Palestine.

Then I had the opportunity of discussing the problems with officials of the government, with the then high commissioner of Palestine. I must say

that my impressions of the country were of such a nature that I became very pro-Palestine after I visited it. I saw most of the developments that have taken place there. This is some twelve years ago since I was there, but conditions have not changed very much recently between then and now, except as has been pointed out by Mr. Leger, the chairman, and other members of the committee who asked questions that it is a tragic situation in the world. I think it is one of the most tragic situations the world has ever faced where you find 5,000,000 Jews have been exterminated in Europe, and to-day there are 1,500,000 left, most of them crying for a refuge somewhere where they know they will be safe in body and limb, at least.

To come back to Palestine I visited the first class city of Telaviv. I remember discussing the situation there with the then mayor of the city. He told me some rather remarkable stories. We stood there on the balcony of the city hall. They had a population of 75,000 where at the beginning of the century there was hardly a soul there. He told me that when he got there the land on which Telaviv was built was sold for a load of tobacco that a camel could carry but when I was there land was selling at $4,000 per lineal foot. I cannot say what the population is to-day, but it must be almost doubled.

Mr. JAQUES: 200,000.

Mr. HEAPS: I am glad that you have taken such an interest in the Palestine question that you know it much better than I do. It has grown in ten years from 75,000 to approximately 200,000, and there has not been one Arab who has been displaced in the whole country as the result of that influx of population.

May I state here that I do not think there is a Jew that I know of anywhere in the world who wants to do the least bit of harm to any Arab either inside or outside of Palestine. Unfortunately there are certain conditions under which most of the Arabs have been raised. I saw things there that aroused my pity more than my anger. I remember going past one of the buildings where the pogroms of 1929 had taken place, where Jews were killed in fairly large numbers. I went by one institution which had been a children's orphanage. It had been ransacked and burned and many of the children there had been slaughtered.

To go a little further along those lines the Jewish organizations of the world have brought into being in Palestine a great many medical clinics. Unfortunately the Arab of Palestine is a very backward person. I am speaking of the masses. I think we are dealing with the masses of the people principally. I was told that 90 per cent of the Arab population was suffering at that time from trachoma in one form or another. The Jewish women's organization had established these clinics which were patronized almost exclusively by the Arab population.

Mr. LEGER: Suffering from what?

Mr. HEAPS: Trachoma. It is an eye disease and one of the most contagious diseases known to medical science.

Mr. FRASER: And no cure.

Mr. HEAPS: They have some method of alleviating it. It is not an entire cure but it helps.

Mr. FRASER: To hold it at its present stage but not to make it any better.

Mr. HEAPS: I believe you are right. I am not a medical man, but I was told by one of the medical men, Dr. Granofsky, who was there at the time, that 50 per cent of the cases they had treated for that disease had been arrested, and in mild cases they had probably brought about a cure. Yet when the riots took place in 1929 the very first places that the Arab population plundered,

burned and destroyed were these very clinics which were helping the Arab population.

As I said I do not say this in any anger. I say it more in pity for people who could be led into such an avenue of action. I mentioned to you the growth of the population of Telaviv. I was shown around the industries there. You might be interested because we are in Ottawa to-day. I went into an artificial teeth factory there which had just recently been established and which employed about 300 people. A certain party in the United States could not get a patent for a new kind of patent tooth in the United States so he went to Palestine and go a patent there. Then he repatented it in all parts of the world. I do not know whether any of you have false teeth in your head but you may be wearing teeth that have come from Palestine. I told the owner of the factory that I came from Ottawa. He immediately went into his inside office and brought out invoices showing that he had obtained felspar, the stone from which teeth are made, which was actually obtained in the Gatineau valley near Ottawa, sent to Palestine and came back to Canada in the form of false teeth.

In the same city I saw a textile mill where formerly there was nothing but sand dunes. I saw candy factories, brass factories and even leather goods factories. I was amazed when I saw leather goods there. I said to the owner of the factory, "How do you come to have leather when there are no cows and no skins?" He said, "We manage it somehow. We have set up a goat farm and make these leather goods out of goat skin." I opened one of the bags there and in French was written "Latest Parisian creation". They were going to Paris. I am just showing you the development that has been carried on there by enterprising Jews who have come there from different parts of the world.

Then you can go, as I went, and see the electrical works. It was stated by engineers in all parts of the world that the old staid Jordan could never be harnessed for electrical development, but the Jordan was harnessed. To-day you have hydro electric energy in practically all parts of Palestine, but when I was there the Arabs still refused to use the electricity because it was owned by a Jewish company.

You have those problems, and I will deal with them in a moment or two. I want to say when I came here this morning, as I said to you at the outset, I had no intention of speaking, and I have no prepared statement. What I am saying is entirely of an extemporaneous character.

I remember another occasion when I went through the country there. Between Telaviv and Jerusalem there is a very beautiful road through the mountains. I was shown a piece of land which I would say may have been about thirty acres all told. This is not a hearsay story. I said to the man who was showing me around, "Why is it you stop and show me this piece of territory?" He said, "There is an interesting story behind it. I will tell you the story". He said that the priests in the district had been preaching for many months that no Arab should sell his land to the Jews, and the Arab population which is very loyal to their church and to the priests refused to sell the land to the Jews. The result was that the Jews were not buying land and naturally the price of land came down to a very low figure because there were no purchasers.

Mr. LEGER: Pardon me, you mentioned the word "priest". Do you mean Catholic priests?

Mr. HEAPS: Moslem priests; I should have made that clear. The Arabs are usually Moslems. I am glad you questioned me there. The land fell down in value, and finally the priest and those who were with him got an option on the property and in a very short time were in possession of it. They got a very good price for the land. The Arab people get £100 an acre for stony land.

The CHAIRMAN: An acre?

Mr. HEAPS: Yes, £100 per acre for stony land. When the original pioneers went into Palestine they drained these malaria infected swamps with their own hands and whatever primitive tools they could get. When you go through the country to-day you can see here and there in various places little stone monuments to these original pioneers who were victims of malaria when they first went into the country.

Agricultural growth and development has been mentioned. The chairman has mentioned that I had a little to do with the obtaining of the right to entry into this country without duty of Palestinian oranges, which is perfectly correct. Speaking to members of the citrus exchange I asked them if they had the most up to date methods of orange growing. They told me they had the best entomologists and agriculturists from California come to Palestine and discuss the question with them. These professors from the universities in California told them that California could teach nothing to the Jewish agriculturists in Palestine. There you have in Palestine this rather unique situation where former swamps have been turned into beautiful orange groves producing some of the finest oranges you could get anywhere in the world.

Mr. LEGER: May I ask a question? What kind of produce are they growing, just oranges?

Mr. HEAPS: I will come to that in a moment. Where there were swamps now you have orange groves and dairy farms. On the hills which were so bare and barren you have eucalyptus trees planted by the hundreds of acres. Where you had sand dunes before you now have flourishing cities. To say that has hurt the Arab population of the east is something that I cannot understand. I cannot understand how anyone could ever say that could have hurt the people who originally lived there, because if you want to know what that means you have but to stand on the west bank of the river Jordan and face east towards Transjordania. When you look at Transjordania, a country that is larger in square miles than Palastine is to-day, you see a barren wilderness with people living there as nomads. Then you turn around and face west and you see a country that in the space of 40 years or less has grown into a modern small country, and those with whom I have discusseed it believe it is still capable of absorbing great numbers of people.

One very great problem was the problem of milk supply in the country. Children had to be fed on canned milk imported from other countries. The agricultural scientists they had at the university in Jerusalem spent five years in experimenting with cows. Finally they were able by cross breeding to produce a cow that could stand the Palestinian climate. To-day the children of Palestine, whether they are Arabs or Jews, are able to obtain milk from the cows and have a fresh supply of milk as they need it, and in fairly good proportion.

Mr. JACKMAN: What is the climate like?

Mr. HEAPS: It depends. When you get into the hills you have a climate something like that out at the coast.

Mr. WINKLER: Have they not got a good deal of goat milk also?

Mr. HEAPS: Yes, they have developed quite a goat industry, too, because the goats are able to graze on the mountain sides there. I went from Jerusalem down to the Dead Sea to see the potash works which are located there. You go down a distance of approximately 40 miles from Jerusalem. Jerusalem is about 28,000 feet above sea level and when you get down to the Dead Sea you are 1,400 feet below sea level.

Mr. KNOWLES: You said 28,000.

Mr. HEAPS: It is 2,800. That was a little slip of the tongue. The Dead Sea is 1,400 feet below sea level. There is a tremendous difference in the climate between Jerusalem and the Dead Sea. When I was at Jerusalem it was quite cool and I took an overcoat with me but when I got down to the Dead Sea

I found I had to take my coat off and I would have taken anything else off if I could have.

Mr. JACKMAN: Does it get tropical in any part?

Mr. HEAPS: Yes, it gets tropical in these level parts of the country. Of course, that is one of the reasons why they are able to grow all this produce there. I would not say that it is exactly completely tropical, but semi-tropical.

Mr. KNOWLES: Something like California?

Mr. HEAPS: Yes, very much like California. I could go on a little about my personal experiences there, but I know the limitations that are imposed upon the committee by parliamentary rules and procedure. There is one thing I do not think ought to be lost sight of by this committee in your deliberations. I know you will not report, but a certain amount of publicity has been given to your deliberations and no doubt will be given, as I understand, this morning. We are faced with a great humanitarian question. When you are faced with a humanitarian question, as we are at the present time, it transcends even the nationalism of one particular race or one particular creed or one particular nation. We cannot altogether escape responsibility for what is taking place in other parts of the world. When a hurt is done to one it is a hurt that is done to another. For instance, when fever breaks out in any one part of the world you have a quarantine right away in this country against the plague that may develop here if it is not checked and taken care of in time. When you have this great humanitarian problem with which you are faced in Europe I think it is a good thing for a committee of parliament to consider it so that you may become fully acquainted with the problem even if you cannot report on it. Seventy per cent of the Jewish population in Europe has been wiped out. A good proportion of the other 25 per cent to-day are living in concentration camps. They are living under hardships and do not know what is going to happen to-morrow.

As has been pointed out if 100,000 Jews were moved to Palestine it would to a certain extent ease the problem in Europe and I would say that it would create no hardship for the Arab. If you had 100,000 Jews enter Palestine and had to develop the country further you would find in a very short period there would be 100,000 additional land holdings in the country. I can see that it is about 10 minutes to 1. I know that when you have sat here for two and a half hours, as I have often sat in this room under the same circumstances, you are all anxious to rise and call it a morning. All I can say is I want to thank the members of this committee for giving me their attention this morning.

Mr. LEGER: Do you not think that our Canadian embassy in England is taking up the matter very seriously with Great Britain already?

Mr. HEAPS: I hope so, and very sympathetically.

Mr. LEGER: Do you not think that the mentality of our Canadian people would lead us to believe that?

Mr. HEAPS: What is going on in the state department is usually a state secret, but I have the impression that there will be something done.

Mr. LEGER: I believe that these matters are contentious and that we must proceed in the most delicate manner. I think that is the attitude to-day.

Mr. HEAPS: I am not suggesting that you take any action here at all. I siad I knew the limitations that were imposed on your committee here. I know that you can only go a certain length. It was not even referred to you by the House of Commons. It may be that you went a little beyond your jurisdiction in having what you might call this open forum here to discuss the question, but I appreciate it that you have done what you did.

Mr. LEGER: Would you agree that the committee is more or less sympathetic on the question?

Mr. HEAPS: I think that generally speaking I would say yes, and I would say that even goes for Mr. Jaques.

Mr. JAQUES: I think I made my stand clear. My purpose here is purely and simply to elicit information.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Heaps, in listening to you it came logically to my mind the good fortune we have had in listening to you. Although we may have differed with your policies we have never doubted your sincerity. The members of our committee appreciate your contribution to this wonderful debate and presentation.

Mr. JAQUES: What about to-morrow?

The CHAIRMAN: To-morrow we begin to sit in the morning in the House.

Mr. KNOWLES: It has not passed the House yet.

The CHAIRMAN: No, but we hope we do. We intend to have the Arabic organization come before us on Friday of this week at 10.30. I know it will be hard to have a meeting at that time but we will do the best we can. If you will leave it to the chairman I will do what I can taking the circumstances into consideration. As to our report due to the fact I have asked the members to present their reaction as to making a final report we will not have a meeting of the steering committee this week but we will have a general discussion of the report early next week if that is satisfactory to the members. I want to thank the witnesses for being here this morning.

The committee adjourned at 12.55 p.m. to meet again on Friday, July 26, 1946, at 10.30 o'clock a.m.

SESSION 1946

HOUSE OF COMMONS

282

STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 16

FRIDAY, JULY 26, 1946

WITNESSES:

Dr. George Kheirallah, Publisher *The Arab World*, New York.
Mr. K. Hulusy Khairy, Director of the Arab Office, Washington, D.C.
Mr. M. S. Massoud, President Canadian-Arab Friendship League, Montreal.
Mr. E. Karam, Secretary Canadian-Arab Friendship League, Ottawa.

OTTAWA
EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., B.A., L.Ph.,
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
1946

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

FRIDAY, July 26, 1946.

The Standing Committee on External Affairs met at 11.30 o'clock a.m. The Chairman, Mr. Bradette, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Bradette, Cote (*Matapedia-Matane*), Graydon, Jackman, Jaenicke, Jaques, Kidd, Leger, Low, Mutch, Tremblay and Winkler.

In attendance: Dr. Geo. Kheirallah, Publisher *The Arab World*, New York City, N.Y. Mr. K. Hulusy Khairy, Director of the Arab Office, Washington, D.C. Mr. M. S. Massoud, President Canadian-Arab Friendship League, Montreal. Mr. E. Karam, Secretary, Canadian-Arab Friendship League, Ottawa.

The Chairman asked the Clerk to read three questions which had been asked Mr. Mowat by Mr. Winkler after the last meeting and the answers thereto by Mr. Mowat. The Committee agreed to have them printed as an appendix to this day's report. (*See* appendix "A").

The Committee resumed the hearing of representations on the Palestine situation, the case of the Arabs being presented to-day.

Dr. Kheirallah opened the Arab submission with an address outlining the historical background of the Arab Race.

Messrs. Massoud and Khairy read lengthy briefs.

It was decided on the motion of Mr. Leger that the Committee meet again this day, to examine witnesses.

At 1.10 p.m. the Committee adjourned to meet again at 3.30 p.m. this day.

FRIDAY, July 26, 1946.

The Standing Committee on External Affairs met at 3.30 o'clock p.m. The Chairman, Mr. Bradette, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Boucher, Bradette, Cote (*Matapedia-Matane*), Graydon, Jackman, Jaenicke, Jaques, Leger, Low, Tremblay and Winkler.

In attendance: The same Arab representatives as at morning meeting and Rabbi Jesse Schwartz, Executive Director Zionist Organization of Canada.

The Committee resumed consideration of the Palestine situation.

Messrs. Kheirallah and Khairy were recalled, examined and retired.

Rabbi Schwartz clarified some statements which had been given in the Zionist case presented earlier.

The Chairman stated that at the next meeting the Committee would consider its report.

The Committee on the motion of Mr. Winkler adjourned at 5.45 p.m. to meet at 11.30 o'clock a.m. Tuesday, July 30, 1946.

F. J. Corcoran,
Clerk of Committee.

69193—1½

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

July 26, 1946.

The Standing Committee on External Affairs met this day at 11.30 o'clock a.m. The Chairman, Mr. J. A. Bradette presided.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call the meeting to order. We know that the people who appeared before us at our previous meetings representing the Zionist movement and the people who are here today representing the Arab movement will appreciate the fact, despite the number of committees and the amount of parliamentary business which is proceeding at the present time, we are able to have a quorum here this morning. Personally I want to thank the members for coming here this morning to attend this meeting which I regard and which I am sure you regard as very important.

Before we proceed with hearing the representations may I say that Mr. Winkler asked some questions of Mr. Mowat, and with your permission I will have the clerk of the committee read the questions and answers and then they can be placed on the record.

(Questions and answers appear as Appendix A to this report.)

Now, we have asked to come before us this morning people representing the Arab viewpoint on the Palestine question, and after this meeting is over we will have had the opportunity of listening to the representatives of two great and noble races with a fine historical past. I know that these gentlemen will realize how serious their representation is and I believe the same line of conduct will be followed in regard to the utterances of these gentlemen, because we are dealing with international problems. Canada is interested in these problems and hopes to play some part in their solution, but we all realize what Great Britain is doing at the present time in conjunction with some other great powers of the world.

We have with us this morning Mr. K. Hulusy Khairy, Director of the Arab Office, Washington, D.C., Mr. M. S. Massoud, President of the Canadian-Arab Friendship League, and we have also with us Dr. George Kheirallah and Mr. Elias Karam, who is the secretary. We will follow the same procedure as in the previous meeting. The speakers will present their case and it will be left to the members of the committee to decide whether they will be interrogated immediately afterwards or after all the briefs have been presented. I shall now ask Mr. Massoud to come to the front.

Mr. MASSOUD: Mr. Chairman and honourable members of the committee, to begin with I would like to introduce Dr. George Kheirallah, who is the publisher of the *Arab World* Magazine of New York, who will give us the basis of the historical relationship of the Arabs and Jews as he is an authority on history and literature as well.

Dr. George Kheirallah, Publisher of the *Arab World* Magazine, New York, called:

Dr. KHEIRALLAH: Mr. Chairman and honourable gentlemen, mine is a brief and pleasant task, pleasant because it recall better times and better memories. I shall watch the clock and not exceed my time.

The Arabian Peninsula is not the southwest corner of Asia; geolo[illegible]ally speaking, it is the northeast portion of Africa. This peninsula was guarded on the north by the Taurus mountains. All around the west and south of it, it is surrounded by water; on the east the Persian Gulf and beyond that we had the marshes, and the Asiatic side protected by the steep Zugros mountains. Therefore, that spot was isolated in the early existence of man and its isolation protected that certain family at large living there. These tribes led the life of the reindeerman, going north in the summer to the pastures and coming south in the winter with their flocks. However, that is going back into the past, thousands of years. The country is mostly desert with the habitable tract along the water courses. Therefore settlements were established in Iraq, which is Mesopotamia, in Palestine, Syria and in southern Arabia called Arabia Felix. The rest of it was called Arabia Deserta, because it is a desert. It is a seething cauldron for any man to live in. But in spite of this there are settlements there. People of the desert have constantly infiltrated and rejuvenated habitable parts of the country. I am not going to dwell on its history. Possibly man was well distributed all over the world, but that is the place where man first took the first step in communal living. We find him in early Akkadian times, 3,000 years B.C., then came the days of the great Assyrian empire and then the second Babylonian empire. Down in the southern part we had the Maa'in civilization of the Arabs.

All those people spoke the same language but with a different dialect, because distances then were long and each tribe developed its own dialect: Hebrew is one, Aramean is another, and the Arabic spoken to-day is a dialect of the tribe of Quraish and all these and others belonged to the same family which we call the Semitic family. At one time, somewhere around 1200 B.C., some migration started out of the desert. These were hungry men who wanted better pastures and who looked with greedy eyes possibly on their brothers who were doing better than they were. That is the coming of the tribes, the Israelitic tribes. They were governed by their chiefs; in the Bible they are called judges. Then followed the days of Saul and of David and then the glorious days of Solomon. Solomon was a vassal and paid his tribute to Egypt. The kingdom did not exceed twelve miles in all directions. The part they inhabited was not the fertile plains which were then occupied by the Canaanites and the Phœnicians, but rather the barren hills of Judea. That was 945 B.C. The kingdom of Solomon grew and then disintegrated, but you have followed the course of it. However, these people had not had the benefits of culture or civilization of any kind; they were people whose most precious possession was the Ark of the Covenant and the Tablets of the Law kept until then in a tent. They did not have either architecture or builders, so when they built the temple, they had to call on Hiram the Phœnician to build it for them. Things went along until 722 B.C. when Sargon II, King of Assyria invaded the Arameans of Syria and fought with these cousins of ours, our own people, dwellers of the land. For two years he besieged Damascus, and when it fell there was no resistance left to oppose him. He marched south and carried off the ten tribes. That was the last that was heard of them in spite of the fact that Englishmen and Scotsmen sometimes say that some of them may have come to England. Maybe they did. That was the end of them. They left the tribe of Judah and Benjamin until one hundred and thirty-five years later when Nebuchadnezzer came down and swept them into exile. That is the extent of Jewish civilization.

Now, in 500 and some years B.C. when the Persians conquered Babylon and the remaining Jews were set free they came back as cultured scholars because they had been prisoners in the most enlightened medium of the old world. Babylon then was the greatest centre of learning. They left us great libraries as witnesses. They have one library in the British museum which was found almost intact with 20,000 written tablets. They were competent and good men.

Ezra and his confreres wrote the Old Testament as it has come to us. They borrowed traditions here and there, some of which are perfectly good history because they came back from an enlightened country where they had learned much. After that their existence becomes more precarious until the days of the Romans, and you know what happened then.

Now, in 636 a man by the name of Mohammed arose among the Arabs and promulgated his faith, good or bad, just as you care to look at it; but he united the Arabs. By that I mean that he united the warring tribes, and they came out of the desert to liberate their brother Arabs who were in Syria ruled by the Byzantines. As they moved along this was the admonition which the Caliph, Abu-Bakr delivered to his soldiers:—Betray not, nor take anyone unaware, practise no excesses, nor retaliate in kind, kill not an old man, woman or child, destroy not a planted field, cut not a palm tree, kill not a goat or camel or sheep excepting for food! That was the chivalry that the Arabs introduced into the world and which gave them in a short time a greater empire than that possessed by Rome. They swept aside the Persian empire as well as the Byzantine empire.

Now, when they came into the Holy Land, the Jewish people, who were kinsmen, had reached the lowest state of debasement in all their history. What did the Arab do? They took the Jews under their protection; opened all the avenues for them everywhere in the world; there were no restrictions and no discriminations. The schools were open to them, and as a result there arose what is called sometimes the Golden Age of Jewry, and that age was the product of the Arabian schools. They held in turn high positions like that held by Hasdi, who became the prime minister of the Western Khalifah.

Al Hasdi was a product of the Arabian schools, likewise was the great Maimonedis who studied in Cordova and came to Morocco from 1160 to 1165 and studied at the University of Fez. Later he went into the service of the Children of Saladin and when the British were at Askalon in southern Palestine and begged him to go with them he stayed with his people. He wrote only one book for the Jews and that is the "Guide to the Perplexed" which was written in Arabic. It was translated by Ibn Tibon into Hebrew.

The Hasdi revived the Hebrew language which had fallen into disuse. The Talmud was written in Hebrew, but the Gemara was written in Aramaic. When Jesus spoke, he spoke not a word of Hebrew, he spoke in the Aramaic language or the Aramaic dialect. Why? Because the Hebrew tongue had fallen into disuse. Therefore, this man Hasdi revived the Hebrew language, and that was the first revival of the Hebrew dialect.

Bahya ibn Pacudah, the man who wrote the fine ethics of the Jew, wrote in Arabic. Judah Ha Levi, Ben Gabriol, Ben Ezras, Ben Yusuf, Ben Labrat and others all wrote in Arabic—products of the Arabian schools. I can go on and name many others in the Golden Age of Jewry. They were all scholars of Arabian schools and they prospered.

Then came the time when the Arabs left Spain. That was the time the Jews commenced to feel persecution and hardship. They scattered and many of them came back to North Africa and to Syria, to Turkey and to Salonica. The Arabs and Moslems took them into their homes. Those were the Arabian Jews; the rest were scattered.

Now, after that the Jew remained persona grata in the Arab countries, and this was recognized by the United States government in 1812. President Madison and Secretary of State Monroe, when they had difficulty with the Barbary Coast, picked a Jew from Charleston, South Carolina, and sent him over there from 1812 to 1815 where he collaborated with Commodore Decateur and helped straighten out that matter for the American government. Jews were welcomed in Moslem countries. Thus the U.S.A. delegated as ambassadors to Turkey men like Straus, Morgenthau, Elkus and Steinhard.

Why was this done? Because the world recognized that the Jew was always welcome among the Moslems. That is why the entente lasted 1400 years. Mordecai Noeh, President Madison's envoy, wrote a book on the condition of the Jew and told how Hamouda in Tunis called over the American minister and had him kiss the Jew whom he had slapped in the customs house, and made him make up with him.

Then there was the entry of France into Algeria. That was in 1830, and came about when the pascha there, slapped the French representative with a fan because France had refused to pay two Jews whose ships of grain were sent to France.

The entente was well known. All the Arab Moslem countries received Jews. In Egypt today they are vociferous against Zionism. So are they in Iraq, Syria and Lebanon.

The Jewish merchants from Stamboul went into the Tartary country, the Caspian district and Judaeized the Kharzar Tartars. The result is that when you see thousands and thousands of Polish, Russian and Rumanian Jews they have neither the Semitic wisdom or the blood. They are Tartars, and the Arabs to-day are constantly confronted with this invasion—the second Tartar invasion!

Well, gentlemen, this is the case as far as the Arabs are concerned. We were stunned in the beginning and could not realize this condition. We were shocked, we became angry and were resentful. The people we had befriended for 1,400 years did not come to us in a friendly spirit as they used to; they came and said to us: "This is our land." These are Tartars from Tartary coming into a Semitic country because they followed a Semitic religion, and the Arabs have not taken kindly to it.

The campaign in America has been one of vilification. The say: What did the Arabs do? They never did anything! I walked this morning through the hall of this building and I saw the crystal gothic arches which are the product of the Arabian horseshoe arch, the cusped arch and the intersecting arches, products of Arabian architecture. I am not going into that phase of it; I am not going to show what the Arabs have produced and can do again. Apart from the alphabet the Arab has produced a distinct civilization, a distinct pattern of living.

Gentlemen, the Arabs object to having their seaboard taken over. It is not an honourable intention. These people have adopted the refugee question and have put it forward as a smoke-screen for political purposes.

Now, before I leave this matter to my confreres may I just say one word to you gentlemen about Canada. You have the most glorious country in the world. I am not saying that because I am here, because I have repeated it many times from the rostrum. You have the richest country in material resources, and this country will some day, have 200,000,000 people and will support them too. But you have something better: you have the liberal spirit of the French pioneer; you have the sturdy Scotch sense, the canny sense and discrimination of the Scotsman. If you support the Zionist movement just to force upon us anything like 100,000 of these people which is a trick to increase the already overflowing population of the country, what will you do? You would lay yourself open to ridicule by the historians of your own people. Your country will take in 200,000,000 people and you want to force upon us an additional 100,000 which we are unwilling to receive. It would not be fair to your Scotch sense or to your French sense of justice to do that.

Now, I do not mean that you should bring them here; it is the farthest thing from my thought to make out of your country a bed of red roses to all comers.

The CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you might have mentioned the Irish and the English.

Mr. KHEIRALLAH: Before making my apologies to the Irish and the English, let me say that I have been very fortunate to have a better-half in my household who is Irish.

The CHAIRMAN: I will now call on the next speaker.

Mr. M. S. Massoud, President of the Canadian-Arab Friendship League, called.

Mr. MASSOUD: Gentlemen, permit me to convey to you some of the views held on the problem of Palestine by Canadians of Arab descent, in particular by the members of the Canadian Arab Friendship League, whom I have the honour to represent.

First of all, may I state that the well-timed and aggressively advanced agitation for the creation of an independent Jewish state in Palestine has been as diligently pursued by the Zionists in Canada as in the United States, and has been the subject of controversy in the press and among members of the Canadian parliament. The majority of Canadians view this whole problem seriously, for tragic mistakes made by diplomats have often resulted in bloodshed and deep suffering. We have had too much of that.

The Palestine issue has reached proportions and has brought consequences for many nations which make it imperative for all right-thinking people to examine the facts underlying the present murder and cold-blooded killing of innocent people and British soldiers stationed in the Holy Land to do their duty.

The recent bombing of the King David Hotel in Jerusalem, the killing of Lord Moyne and of hundreds of other innocent people during the past few years have certainly provided proof that Zionist terrorists, extremists and whatever you may call them had the approval of their leaders, and we may safely say of the leaders of the Jewish Agency. The British Government must be in possession of authentic evidence, otherwise it would never have taken the steps announced during the past few days, including the arrest of Bernard Joseph, a Montrealer, who served as vice-president of the Jewish Agency and who is known to Canadians as their ace propagandist. He and others like him have tried in vain to condition this continent for Zionist falsehood. There were many who at one time believed them; to-day, people of the western hemisphere through the daily press are getting a better picture of Zionist intrigues. Since the now famous General Morgan incident—which led to the resignation of Governor Lehman as head of the UNRRA—people everywhere have begun to doubt those glowing statements by Zionists about Jewish aspirations to Palestine. To-day we know that Zionists are following a definite plan, not to remove the misery of European Jews in general, but to establish their own political power over the Arabs.

The people who protested against being uprooted in other places should never propose the uprooting of the Arabs from their own soil. The people who prayed for justice should not attempt to get even with the inhabitants of Europe, who committed the injustice against them, by inflicting in turn injustice on the Arab.

The words of the Balfour declaration to the Zionists have become an issue. The Zionists asked for the following wording: "The reconstruction of Palestine as a national home of the Jewish people." This was refused. Instead, the Balfour declaration read: "The establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people."

In its first official statement before receiving the mandate, the English Government in 1922, while Churchill was minister of colonies, answered the Zionists' request for a change of wording, as follows:—

289

> We draw attention to the fact that the terms of the declaration do not contemplate that Palestine as a whole should be converted into a Jewish national home but that such a home should be founded in Palestine . . . What is meant is not an imposition of a Jewish nationality upon the inhabitants of Palestine as a whole.

Gentlemen of the committee, the Arabs do not come to you with an Arab problem, but hold that it is unbecoming to bring pressure on war-weary England to do an injustice to an ally, and to go against the interests of the commonwealth.

Acting on the experience of 25 years and the findings of thirteen royal commissions, England in 1939 corrected, in a measure, a mistake and issued a specific document, more specific by far than the vague Balfour letter to Baron Rothschild. This correction is unmistakable and clear.

> His majesty's government therefore now declares unequivocally that it is not part of their policy that Palestine should become a Jewish state. They would indeed regard it as contrary to their obligation to the Arabs under the Mandate, as well as to the assurances which have been given to the Arab people in the past, that the Arab population of Palestine should be made the subject of a Jewish State against their will.

Are these unmistakable clearcut pledges to be ignored because the Zionists claim political influence in the United States?

To the English speaking peoples we say, let not a compact, determined political pressure group misguide you in order to coerce a sorely tried England who wants to put her house in order.

The issue of the political Zionists and their objectives are the establishment of a religious state in Palestine, regardless of the natural rights of the people who have inhabited that country twice as long as the English have inhabited England. But I beg to draw your sober attention to the fact that the real issue is being deliberately confused, and the European refugee and his plight—a horse of a different colour, is cleverly used to befog the true purpose and to gain the sympathy of the unwary.

The Arabs make a clear distinction between the Jew who is a follower of the Hebraic faith, and the political Zionist who aims to establish a kingdom or republic on charity (deducted from American, Canadian and English taxes), to arm and equip it at the expense of world Jewry, and to extend it from the Nile to the Euphrates as Hertzl advocated. The reason put forth for this chauvinistic scheme is the desire to accredit representatives and agents to the various countries that they may keep their finger on the pulse of nations, in order to safeguard the interests of Jewry. While this may sound fantastic, we have noted their manipulation in politics where they have been able to use pressure on most candidates and parties. They have committed a sin against American and Canadian Jewry by dragging and injecting the Jew and his affairs into the national conventions of some political parties into the halls of Congress and parliament, and have made Zionism and its endorsement a primary consideration in elections. They have also planted anti-Jewish sentiment in Asia and Africa when none existed before.

The so-called Jewish problem will be solved when the process of integration has been enhanced, when the Jews consider themselves and are considered by others as people different only in their devotion to their religion.

Instead of making Palestine as Jewish as England is English, according to Dr. Weizman, make the Jew in England, English; in America, American, and in Canada, Canadian. Wherever the concept of a separate race or nationality status has prevailed, this process is stultified. The average Jew and the average Arab want peace and happiness; ambitious leaders have deceived the Jew on the Palestine issue and are today creating confusion among English speaking people.

Palestine, the land of the Philistines has an area of 10,000 square miles, two-thirds of which is not fit for cultivation. It has at present 700,000 Jews and 1,200,000 Arabs. The death rate is 24 per thousand: and the birth rate is 52 per thousand; without the addition of a single immigrant, the country will double its populaiton within the next thirty years.

In addressing you as democrats, we ask you to recognize that the land belongs to those who inhabit it. Elementary political sense and democratic feeling must recognize that no people will submit to being a minority in their own home land. Do you propose to force Arabs to accept immigration against their will until they are in a minority in their own land? Do you wish to uproot the Arabs by British or Canadian arms? The intent of the Zionists has come into the open. It is not a humanitarian project but a political scheme. Why the hundred thousand? There are three million Jews in Europe. Why be callous about the rest? The scheme involved is a step towards the Zionists' objectives of establishing a majority. With due respect I wish that this august body who is obliged to look for the welfare of a mere fraction of the millions of humans who are suffering misery to include the other forty millions of non-Jewish children of God who are in pitiful plight.

Listening to American politicians, we are astounded that Canadians who stand for the right and protection of minorities, should disregard the rights of the majority, that taxation and immigration be forced on a voiceless peasantry who have been brought up to believe in democratic fairness.

Gentlemen, in conclusion I should like to draw your attention to some of the outstanding arguments advanced by Zionists before this committee last week.

They spoke of the Zionist or Jewish war effort. By implication, they belittled the tremendous assistance and sacrifices during the last war on the part of the Arabs.

For your information, I wish to state that a great number of the 25,000 Jewish volunteers mentioned by the Zionists were women or non-combatants. Their casualties were nearly nil. The Arabs on the other hand, have suffered 16,500 casualties at the battle of Tunisia alone. Three thousand were left dead on the field of that one battle. The United States equipped and armed 350,000 North African Arabs who broks the Marath Line in Italy and fought gallantly throughout the war. Their estimated casualties were one hundred and thirty some thousand men. Jewish and Zionists in particular have forgotten that 1,500,000 Moslems were serving in allied armies and fighting for the British Empire. Zionists, of course, would not mention that the number of Indian Moslems serving in the British Merchant Marine during the last war was greater than the total number of Jewish volunteers mentioned by them.

If the speaker for Zionists who appeared before the committee last week believes that his assumption regarding the Zionist percentage amongst Jews is correct, I should like to ask you, gentlemen, whether it would not be fair to hold the Jewish people as a whole responsible for the acts of terrorism and for the flood of propaganda lies, now sweeping through Palestine and I might say a large part of the world. I, personally do not believe that 95 per cent of the Jewish people are in favour of a Jewish state in Palestine at the expense of open warfare with Britain and the Arab nations.

Zionist claims that Jewish immigration into Palestine had brought important benefits to Arabs are another fabrication of falsehood. How can Jewish people, liberated by Allied soldiers from the filth of their European ghettos bring wealth, sanitation, or culture to Arabs? Some of these poor people who entered Palestine illegally in the hope of finding the promised haven in the Jewish Agency buildings in Jerusalem and Haifa are already preparing to return to Austria, Czechoslovakia, and other European countries because Zionist hospitality and claims in regard to Palestine do not appeal to them. They believed in their propaganda and have ended in despair.

May our presentation of these facts about Palestine clarify some of the confusing statements made by the Zionist Committee and recently repeated by some Canadians, including members of parliament in their appeal to their Jewish voters. I thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Now I will call on Mr. Khairy.

Mr. K. Hulusy Khairy, Director of the Arab Office, Washington, D.C., called.

Mr. KHAIRY: Mr. Chairman, I suppose you would like to know who I am and where I come from. I come from Palestine. I was born there and educated in the American University of Beirut, and I studied for three years in London University. And I am now working as Director of the Arab Office in Washington. I am not speaking on behalf of the Arab Office in Washington or any other organization. What opinions I express here should not reflect on the views of Arabs on this problem.

Gentlemen although this is my first visit to your beautiful country I happen to know something of the history of its people, of their struggle for freedom and, lately, of their great contributions in men and material for the liberation of small nations. For this reason I feel confident that you as their representatives will also appreciate the sacrifices and efforts exercised for the achievement of the same noble aims by all peoples in any land.

Among the people who have taken up the fight for liberty during the last century are the Arabs; more particularly, those of them who live in the Near East. For the last 75 years they have been engaged in the tremendous task of liberating their countries from the foreign influences which have dominated them for almost 400 years. This struggle took a more active shape in the revolt led by King Hussein against the Ottoman empire and on the side of the allies during the first world war. The participation of the Arabs in that war was in return for a definite pledge guaranteeing the liberty and independence of all the territories within the Turkish empire inhabited by Arabs. The story of the Arabs of Palestine is part and parcel of this struggle and it is precisely for this reason that the political sentiments of the Arabs of Palestine are generally shared, not only by the governments of the neighbouring Arab states, but by the inhabitants of those countries as well. These countries have pledged themselves to support the Palestine Arab to the extent that may be required in order to protect the integrity of that country and secure the independence of its people.

Until 1917 Palestine in its present form never existed as a separate political entity. Until that time it formed part and parcel of Syria. Its population and then amounting to some 750,000 were 90 per cent Arab, 9 per cent Jew and 1 per cent foreign nationals. This carving out of Palestine was carried out against the expressed will of the inhabitants of both present day Syria and Palestine and against the explicit British pledges and implicit international guarantees.

The Arabs of Palestine are descendents of the indigenous inhabitants of that territory who have been in occupancy of it since the beginning of history. They feel and believe that Palestine is their country in the same sense and for the same reasons that England is English, France is French, and Canada is Canadian. They cannot agree that it is right to subject this indigenous population against its will to alien immigrants whose claim is based upon historical connection which ceased effectively many centuries ago. Forming the majority of the population they are also opposed to any policy of immigration which would ultimately lead to reducing them into a minority in an alien state. Further, they claim the democratic right of a majority to make its own decisions in matters of important national concern.

This natural right of the Arabs of Palestine to live in it in full freedom, to remain in undisturbed possession of it, to develop it in harmony with their

tr ions and ideas, and to exercise in it all the privileges and responsibilities th. are enjoyed by all the majorities in the world, was further recognized and confirmed explicitly by Great Britain and her allies in the various undertakings and statements made during the first world war and implicitly by the principles which underlay the aims of the allies during the first world war and the United Nations during the second world war. Thus any support given by any government to the Zionists is not only contradictory to the rights of the Arabs, but is also a clear violation of solemn international obligations.

Nor was this right ever disputed by any one or any counter-claim ever contemplated against it by any nation: not even by the Jews whose right to raise such a claim as a nation is highly questionable. For they belong to many nations and owe their loyalty and allegiance to the many countries where they live and where they earn their livelihood. It must also be remembered that Jews cannot claim Palestine as their national home and at the same time demand the right for equal treatment. Such, if granted, would amount to a privilege incompatible treatment. Such, if granted, would amount to a privilege incompatible with the principe of equal rights. It is further maintained that not until lately have Zionist leaders made public their intentions of reconstituting Palestine as a Jewish state. In 1931 Dr. Weizmann, in an address to the Zionist Organization of which he is president, said:—

> The Arabs must be made to feel by deed as well as by word that whatever the future numerical relations of the two nations in Palestine, we on our part contemplate no political domination.

In introducing the history of Zionism, written during 1918, Mr. Sokolov, at that time president of the Zionist organization, wrote:—

> It has been said, and is still being obstinately repeated by anti-Zionists again and again, that Zionism aims at the creation of an independent Jewish state, but this is wholly fallacious. The Jewish state was never a part of the Zionist program.

Nor was such a claim ever sanctioned or approved by any nation or a group of nations. The Balfour Declaration which is often quoted by the Zionists to support their claim for reconstituting Palestine as a Jewish state should be carefully examined. The authors of this document, which was issued in the form of a letter dated November 2, 1917, and addressed to Lord Rothchild and signed by Mr. Balfour, at that time Foreign Secretary, never contemplated such an ambitious scheme. This is how that letter reads:—

> I have much pleasure in conveying to you on behalf of His Majesty's Government the following declaration of sympathy with the Jewish Zionist aspirations, which has been submitted to and approved by the Cabinet. "His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a National Home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing should be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country." I should be grateful if you would bring this declaration to knowledge of the Zionist Federation.

It should be observed that the declaration was made by a group of persons with no international status and responsibilities through an Englishman. In fact, they were members of different nations.

Observe, also, that the letter contains no description of the "Jewish Zionist aspirations" with which His Majesty's Government was in sympathy, nor any definition of the term "a National Home for the Jewish people". Observe,

too, that there was no reference to the political rights in the clause safeguarding other rights of the existing population. The description of the Arabs, at that time constituting some 90 per cent of the total population of Palestine, as an "existing non-Jewish community in Palestine", is contemptuous and insulting. The last sentence of the letter is humourously superfluous, unless used as a smoke screen, as it subsequently became known that the Zionists themselves took the major share in drafting the document. As a whole the Declaration must indeed be unique as a State paper in obscurity of its phrasing, its gratuitous insulting reference to a people who at the time were the allies of Great Britain, and its careful concealment of the ultimate object to which His Majesty's Government hoped to attain.

However, five years after the issue of the Balfour Declaration the British Government realized the necessity of removing these obscurities in order to put an end to the wild interpretations that were being put to it by the Zionists. With this object in view the command paper of 1922 was issued. It contained a clear picture of the intentions of His Majesty's Government and a rather detailed definition of the term "a National Home". This is how it reads:—

> Unauthorized statements have been made to the effect that the purpose in view is to create a wholly Jewish Palestine. Phrases have been used such as that Palestine is to become "as Jewish as England is English". His Majesty's Government regard any such expectation as impracticable and have no such aim in view. Nor have they at any time contemplated the disappearance or the subordination of the Arab population, language or culture in Palestine. They would draw attention to the fact that the terms of the Balfour Declaration referred to do not contemplate that Palestine as a whole should be converted into a Jewish National Home, but that such a home should be founded in Palestine.

The nature of the National Home in Palestine was further described in a detailed form in the same official statement, as follows:—

> During the last two or three generations the Jews have recreated in Palestine a community now numbering 80,000, of whom about one-fourth are farmers or workers on the land. This community has its own political organs; an elected assembly for the direction of its domestice concern; elected councils in the towns and an organization for the control of its schools. It has its elected Chief Rabinnet and Rabbinical Council for its religious affairs. Its business is conducted in Hebrew as a vernacular language and a Hebrew press serves its need. It has its distinguished intellectual life and displays considerable economic activity. This community then, with its towns and country population, its political, religious and social organizations, its own language, its own customs, its own life, has, in fact, national characteristics.
>
> When it is asked what is meant by the development of the Jewish National Home in Palestine, it may be answered that it is not the imposition of a Jewish nationality upon the inhabitants of Palestine on the whole, but the further development of the existing Jewish community, with the assistance of Jews in other parts of the world in order that it may become a centre in which the Jewish people as a whole may take on the grounds of religion and race, with interest and pride.

Since then, gentlemen, this community of 80,000 has increased into a community of something like 600,000 and their holdings in Palestine have multiplied enormously, and in the same white paper of 1939 the British government declared in unmistakable terms that as far as this obligation toward the Jewish national home in Palestine is concerned they regarded that as having been fully discharged.

Even after this interpretation of the Balfour Declaration the Arabs continue to denounce it. They have never recognized, and will never recognize, either the Declaration or the Mandate which embodies it. The first contained a promise which Great Britain was not entitled to make without Arab consent, and which in any case was invalid since it conflicted with a previous and binding British pledge. The second is an illegal document. The terms of the Mandate, which could only have derived their sanction from the Covenant of the League of Nations, are in conflict with the letter and spirit of the relevant article, namely, Article 22 of the Covenant which reads:—

> Certain communities formerly belonging to the Turkish Empire have reached a state of development where their existence as independent nations can be provisionally recognized subject to the rendering of administrative advice and assistance by a mandatory until such time as they are able to stand alone. The wishes of these communities must be a principal consideration in the selection of a mandatory.

The Arabs also continued their opposition to the policy initiated in Palestine on the basis of the Balfour Declaration and the provisions of the Mandate, which opposition manifested itself soon after the issue of that declaration in 1917. Until then the Arabs had always lived in peace and on friendly terms with the Jews who were in Palestine from devotional motives. It was only after the issue of the Balfour Declaration, when the Zionist-Jews began to exhibit political pretentions and revealed their real intentions that Arab fears and opposition were aroused.

Nor were these fears of the Arabs groundless—the policy pursued by Great Britain in Palestine since 1918 has shown that these fears were fully jusitfied. The Arabs have been denied their independence which had been promised to them in the British Government's pledges of the 24th of October 1915, and confirmed in several subsequent pledges in return for their share in the allied victory. A Mandate was imposed upon them of which the terms were a flagrant violation, not only of the promises made to them and of their own natural rights, but also of the right to political independence, which was specifically recognized to them in the Covenant of the League of Nations.

An administration was set up in Palestine, which, for the last 25 years, has exercised unfettered power equivalent to an absolute dictatorship in all the domains of government—legislative, executive, and judicial—thereby denying the Arabs of Palestine, who before the war had enjoyed the privileges of parliamentary representation and ministerial responsibility, the most elementary right of self-government.

The terms of this Mandate were the product of close consultation by the British Government and the Zionist Jews, from which the Arabs, whose country was at stake, were deliberately excluded. In virtue of its provisions and in spite of constant Arab protests, the Mandatory power has enacted legislation to enable the Zionist Jews to pour their immigrants into the country and buy up all the lands they could, with the result that in 20 years the ratio of Arabs to Jews has dropped from 10 to 1 in favour of the Arabs in 1919, to 2 to 1. The Zionists have also made land purchases which are estimated at one-third of the cultivable area in Palestine. Furthermore, these purchases were made in the most fertile tracts of cultivable land in the country, and have resulted in the steady deposition of an increasing number of Arab cultivators, who have been driven to seek a make-shift livelihood elsewhere than on the soil which they had been cultivating for centuries. Arab villages have been razed to the ground, their homes and mosques and their cemeteries entirely wiped out, and their names (which in some cases had historical association) officially erased from the map and replaced by the Hebrew names of some of the new Zionist colonies. Moreover, this acquisition

of land by Jews has led to such congestion in the rural districts that the present average holding in Arab hands is, as has been ascertained by many British commissions of inquiry, no longer sufficient to provide the holder with even the bare needs of subsistence.

By 1936 Arab resistence and opposition had assumed serious proportions. For three years the Arabs revolted, with the consequence that there was complete dislocation of the administration and anarchy prevailed throughout the country. The Arabs suffered heavy casualties: they lost 15,000 men in dead alone, to say nothing of the enormous material destruction which this struggle entailed. By 1939 the British Government was faced with a situation which was described in the following passage of the White Paper:—

> The alternatives before His Majesty's Government are either, (1) to seek to expand the Jewish National Home indefinitely by immigration against the strongly expressed will of the Arab people of the country, or (2) to permit further expansion of the Jewish National Home by immigration only if the Arabs are prepared to acquiesce in it. The former policy means rule by force. Apart from other considerations, such a policy seems to His Majesty's Government to be contrary to the whole spirit of Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, as well as to their specific obligations to the Arabs in the Palestine Mandate. Moreover, the relations between the Arabs and Jews in Palestine must be based sooner or later on mutual tolerance and good will; peace, security and progress of the Jewish National Home itself requires this. Therefore, His Majesty's Government, after earnest consideration, and taking into account the extent to which the growth of the Jewish National Home has been facilitated over the last 20 years, have decided that the time has come to adopt in principle, the second of the alternatives referred to above.

That is to say that no immigration to Palestine will take place against the will of the Arabs. In the same white paper of 1939 the British government has declared that her obligations for the establishment of a national home for the Jews has been fully discharged.

Gentlemen, it is beside the point to argue that Jewish immigrants have benefited the Arabs materially. The argument is demonstrably false. When account is taken of all the changes brought into the economic and social structure of the country by the influx of Jewish money and immigration, the result is found to be on balance dangerously detrimental to the material interest of the Arab population. But even if it were true, the argument is beside the point. In the eyes of the Arabs, the issue is not primarily one of material consequence, but first and foremost one of moral and political values.

Here I should like to add that the density of population in Palestine has been estimated lately. The latest census has not been carried out—no census has been carried out for nearly ten years, but we have a department of statistics which has been working on the basis of the census of 1933. According to this the density of the population in Palestine is something like 175 persons per square mile while in America it is something like 42 persons per square mile, and I tihnk in this country it is less—something like 4 per cent.

Mr. GRAYDON: If those figures are correct that would mean 1,750,000?

Mr. KHAIRY: That is right. It is over that. There are now almost 1,800,000.

Mr. GRAYDON: I think someone in the committee said there were 650,000 Jews and 1,250,000 Arabs.

Mr. KHAIRY: I have not got the exact figures because there has been no official census for the last ten years. It is approximately 1,200,000 Arabs and 600,000 Jews.

Mr. GRAYDON: Someone said there were 650,000 Jews.

Mr. KHAIRY:

Is it right that the Arabs, who have been in continuous occupation of Palestine for over 1300 years, and whose life is deep-rooted in its soil and its countryside, should be either forcibly ejected or squeezed in order to enable the Zionist Jews to establish the Jewish National Home in their midst? That is the real issue.

As to the problem of finding a home for the homeless Jew, it is one that concerns the whole of the civilized world. It is generally conceded that Palestine cannot provide a solution of the Jewish problem and in any case the country has already a far larger population than it can support. It is essential for a comprehensive understanding of both the Palestine problem and the Jewish problem that a distinction be drawn between the two issues. Any attempt to treat them as one can only result in confusion and would render both almost insoluble.

Regarding the relief of Jewish distress in Europe, it is now obvious that only by the joint effort of the Western Powers can this problem be solved. The numbers involved are too large to be affected by any quota which the small land of Palestine can accept. Moreover, those who have studied the problem are more and more convinced that the democracies have no moral justification for imposing upon the Arab World a burden which they themselves are not ready to share. In a united effort to afford relief to suffering Jewry the Arab countries have, through their spokesman Azzam Pasha, Secretary-General of the Arab League, expressed their willingness to play their part in the solution of this problem on an international basis. It is essential that the Western Powers, more particularly Great Britain and the United States, must set the example by such relaxation of their present restrictions against Jewish immigration as may be required. This, gentlemen, applies to all the countries who claim to have any real, genuine sympathy with the suffering of European Jewry.

With this Jewish relief problem solved the sympathy of so many honest people which has been so efficiently exploited by the Zionists to camouflage their political ambitions would come to an end. The Palestine problem in its true perspective as essentially and basically one of territorialism and the right of self-determination becomes clear. The solution also becomes obvious, which is to restore to the inhabitants of Palestine the right of self-determination which has been promised to them and which has been guaranteed by political undertakings and by the principles of the United Nations. Thank you, gentlemen.

The CHAIRMAN: With the agreement of the members of the committee we will meet again at 3.30.

The committee adjourned to meet again to-day at 3.30 p.m.

AFTERNOON SESSION

The committee resumed at 3.30 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, the briefs have been presented and the meeting is open for interrogation.

Mr. LEGER: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask a few questions of Mr. Khairy.

Mr. K. Hulusy Khairy, Director of the Arab Office, Washington, D.C., called:

By Mr. Leger:

Q. Are any Arabs working along with the English in the Palestine government?—A. Government officers? Yes, I was myself a government officer until last year, until I resigned to come to Washington.

By Mr. Jaenicke:

Q. What was your position?—A. A district officer, an officer in charge of the administrative area of Jaffa.

By Mr. Leger:

Q. To whom do you attribute this present disturbance in Palestine?—A. To the activities of Jewish terrorists.

Q. Do the Arabs believe in freedom of speech and religion?—A. Well, in the countries where the Arabs were independent and ruled themselves there was a free press.

Q. And is there freedom of religion also?—A. Yes. I will give you as an example Egypt where there are a million Christian Copts, also Iraq and Syria where there are religious immunities.

Q. In Palestine?—A. We have never had an independent government in Palestine; it is a mandate.

Q. Is there freedom of speech and religion?—A. Well, as far as freedom of religion is concerned, yes, but as to freedom of speech and of the press, the degree of freedom of the press depends upon circumstances. For example, under conditions of disturbance naturally the freedom of the press is restricted.

Q. Now, do the Jews in Palestine believe in freedom of speech and religion?—A. Well, I do not know about that. I have a feeling, however, that the Jewish terrorist movement in Palestine does not make it easy for some Jews to express their views on matters of important concern to those people.

Q. Does the average Arab in Palestine assimilate with the Jews?—A. The average Arab? What do you mean by assimilate? The Arab is distinctly Arab and the Jew is Jew.

The CHAIRMAN: Do they inter-marry?

The WITNESS: No, there is no inter-marrying between Arabs and Jews. But they bear no hatred against the Jews.

By Mr. Boucher:

Q. To what extent do they work with each other?—A. As far as I know, and as you may have known from the presentation, the Jews live in a closed economy. The whole economic planning of the Jews in Palestine is directed toward one single objective, namely, the disposition of the Arabs and the gradual alienation of their lands and the conversion of the country into a Jewish state. I would like to mention in this connection that in 1919 President Wilson sent to Palestine a committee, which became known as the Crane-King Commission,

to investigate into the wishes of the Arabs with respect to their political future. In that report which, unfortunately, has been suppressed, the committee said that from interviews with Zionist leaders in and outside of Palestine they have been told openly and frankly that their policy is to gradually dispossess the Arabs in Palestine.

The CHAIRMAN: Why do you say "suppressed"?

The WITNESS: Dispossess. The report was suppressed because of Zionist influence in the United States.

By Mr. Boucher:

Q. Suppressed by whom?—A. I should not have said suppressed; it was not published.

By Mr. Cote:

Q. Was it shelved?—A. It was not shelved, but it was not submitted to the peace conference either.

Q. Do you mean to say the government of the United States appointed a commission that went to Palestine and did not report officially?—A. I did not say the government. It was President Wilson himself who sent these gentlemen to the Near East to investigate into the wishes of the population there as to their political future.

Q. For the President of the United States?—A. For the President. When they came back to the United States they found him ill and later he died. Would you allow me to read these two paragraphs with regard to this report? This appears in the book *Palestine the Reality* by J. M. N. Jeffries:—

> But at this point the question will surely come: how was it possible to disregard the report at all since thus to act counter to the findings must have been to arouse some degree of international feeling against themselves. The answer is a simple one and possibly may not prove so surprising in the light of the previous doings of men of mark. No public feeling was evoked by the report and no member of the general public read a line of it: there was not a paragraph concerning it in the press—for the sufficient reason that it never appeared—the Crane-King report was suppressed.

Dr. KHEIRALLAH: I was rather shocked at the question whether Arabs believe in freedom of religion or not. I was shocked because we are so close to the Arabs and the Moslems of the world. They are situated not only at the cross-roads of the nations, but also at the heart of all strategic and important points, and have been in close touch with them ever since the Crusades. Now, I am not going into any detail, but Lebanon has absolute freedom of religion, Syria has absolute freedom of religion, Iraq has absolute freedom of religion, Egypt has absolute freedom of religion. In Morocco, long before French occupation, the Jews had their own courts presided over by their own learned rabbis. There is only one section, and that is Hedjaz Hedjaz, which has for centuries been closed to all outsiders, other than Moslems, because in a sense it is considered to be their Holy Land.

Now, on this point of tolerance, as far as the Moslems are concerned—and when we talk about Arabs I realize that in certain sections the Moslems predominate—they came out of Arabia like a flaming sword. They found the Chaldeans with their churches and monasteries and they did not interfere with them, and they moved to where the Christian sects were and when they found them they left them, and they moved into Lebanon and they came to Palestine and to Byzantium with its Orthodox and Greek Catholics and then into Egypt with the Copts with their monasteries and churches. Now, we had one thousand years of Moslem supremacy and those other people are still there with their convents and

their monasteries and their churches. In India where the Moguls ruled and where the Moslems ruled for a thousand years the people who had their temples still have them. There is occasional friction between the different peoples, but this also happens between Methodists and Baptists and has happened between Protestants and Catholics; but there is no question that the Moslems teach tolerance. In Palestine there is a different situation to-day because of the hateful feeling engendered by this Zionist movement.

Mr. LEGER: I will ask you to be very brief and to the point. I asked the same question of the Jews. We are a committee trying to clarify this matter. You said you were shocked.

Dr. KHEIRALLAH: Yes.

Mr. LEGER: You should not be shocked because we asked a question, and I am asking the question and I ask you to be very brief and to the point.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Leger, it is hard for the chair to decide these matters as regards questions which involve a number of problems.

By Mr. Leger:

Q. We were told that Palestine is 10,000 square miles in extent.—A. That is right.

Q. We were told that there are 174 persons per square mile in Palestine. —A. Yes.

Q. That would mean a population at the present time of roughly 1,700,000? —A. That is right. I did point out that these figures are approximate, and they are rather on the conservative side.

Q. That is what I said—approximately. The other group said the same thing. You told us there were approximately 600,000 Jews in Palestine at the present time?—A. Yes.

Q. That would leave 1,200,000 Arabs?—A. That is right.

Q. Did you not tell us this morning that the population would more than double itself in thirty years?—A. I did not say that myself, but I think that is a correct statement. Through the figures of the statistical department in Palestine it has been actually calculated that if the rate of birth continues to be as it was during the last five years and the death rate continues to be as low, the population, without the immigration of one single person, would double in even less than thirty years.

Q. Could you tell the average family in Palestine; how many people are there per family?—A. Actually it has been calculated by Sir John Simpson, who was appointed especially to investigate into the economic life of the Arabs in Palestine, that there is an average of five persons per family.

Q. And what would be the average of the Jewish family?—A. I have no figures to give, but it would be definitely less.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there anyone who can answer that question as regards Jewish families?

Rabbi SCHWARTZ (Executive Director of the Zionist Organization in Canada): I would say that the average Jewish family in Palestine would number four.

Mr. LEGER: Two children per family?

Rabbi SCHWARTZ: Yes.

By Mr. Leger:

Q. Did you not tell us this morning that at least two-thirds of the area of Palestine was non-productive?—A. I did not say that exactly, but I think that it is a correct statement—two-thirds is incultivatable.

Q. I presume you mean to say that two-thirds of Palestine would be a desert?—A. A desert or rocky mountains.

Q. Could that portion, the desert, be made productive through an irrigation system?—A. This is a very complicated question. In the first place it is a question of economics rather than a question of possibilities. Of course, you can spend 100 pounds on rocky soil and make it productive, but whether this production is economic or not, whether it is worth while or not, is another question. I understand on authority that it is almost impossible to increase appreciably the productivity in Palestine on an economic basis. I would like to make that very clear. It is not a question of possibility only.

Q. Would you explain to the committee how many Jews and Arabs fought in this last war, and what their casualties were?—A. I have not that figure for the Arabs. I would ask my colleague, Mr. Massoud, about that. He mentioned this point. It was reported in the brief this morning.

Q. If it was reported in the brief I will not ask for an answer now. Could you tell the committee if there are many Jews seeking entrance into Palestine without first obtaining their permits or papers?—A. Oh, yes. As a matter of fact, the Jewish organization and the Zionist sympathizers in the United States are rather proud of it. I think I could use the word "shocking" this time with full justification. It is shocking to see that statement in the papers in the United States. There was an advertisement which ran something like this: Contribute so much and we will undertake to bring into Palestine against the laws of the country so many Jews from Europe. They were calling for contributions to enable them to break the law.

By Mr. Boucher:

Q. Would you answer that question more definitely by confining your answer to within the past ten years? What would you presume to be the number of Jews who have gotten admission into Palestine other than by legal means?—A. I have not got the means. I do not think the government has the means. There are estimates. I heard Mr. Bergerson testify before the Anglo-American committee in Washington that in one year they have succeeded in having 12,000 get into Palestine. He is the chairman of the league for Hebrew liberation.

By Mr. Leger:

Q. Is it true that prior to the Jews going into Palestine there was no irrigation system?—A. That is not true at all. I am one of those who own an orange grove. It is only twenty-five acres in extent. I share it with four of my brothers. This orange grove was planted by my father long before the Jews came to Palestine, and you cannot have oranges without irrigation.

Q. Are there any Arabs working for the Jews in Palestine?—A. I dare say there are. There is a limited number of Arabs engaged by Jews, but it is only for the purpose of obtaining cheap labour.

Q. Are the Arabs who work for the Jews well paid; are they paid as good wages as other people?—A. I will tell you this. It is a curious fact. In 1933-35 I was the district officer in Jerusalem and at the time we had a very serious problem which was known then as labour picketing. The Jewish Labour Organization organized a campaign to drive out by force Arab labour from public works—all government works within the Jewish area as well as from Jewish-owned property in Palestine. It was a very serious problem, and the government had to interfere and put an end to it.

By Mr. Boucher:

Q. To what extent are Jewish workers engaged by Arabs?—A. Very few of them are engaged because they ask for high wages.

By Mr. Graydon:

Q. May I ask this question? While the Jewish witnesses were here, I asked this question: how do the ordinary rank and file—outside of the leaders of Jewry and Arabs in Palestine—get along together in a general way?—A. As I said a moment ago, until the time when a change in policy was made to undermine their national existence. After the white paper of 1939, which safeguarded the rights of the Arabs in Palestine, the Arabs did not mind associating with the Jews and buying and selling to and from them until the campaign of the Zionists started to abolish the white paper and until they had succeeded in killing the White Paper the atmosphere was calm, but now it is tense and it will continue to be tense, until the Arabs' fears are removed.

Q. In that event your evidence is directly contrary to the Jewish evidence which was that the Arabs and the Jews—the ordinary people among them—get along well together in Palestine.—A. If what they mean is that the rank and file of the Arabs are not conscious of their political rights that is absolutely wrong. The average Arab and the simplest of them knows and is fully conscious of his political rights and he is prepared to fight for them now as in the past.

By Mr. Leger:

Q. Would you say that the standard of living in Palestine is better since the Jews have come in than it was before?—A. I would like the question to be asked differently. The standard of the Arab has risen since 1919, but this is not due to the presence of the Jews The standard of living throughout the Arab countries including Palestine has risen since 1919 because of the impact of western civilization, the interchange of commerce between the Near East and the west, the development of the natural increase and potentialities.

Q. My reason for asking you these questions is that most of them were asked to the other group that was here.—A. I understand.

By Mr. Cote:

Q. I understand that the witness stated this morning that the Balfour Declaration was drafted or was influenced by the Zionist society. I would like to know on what ground you said such a thing.—A. I did not say that; but I do say now that the Balfour Declaration was given for the asking. Who could have worked for it except the Zionists? The Balfour Declaration did not come from heaven as a gift. It was worked for and asked for and it could not be asked for by anybody else except the Zionists.

Q. I understood the gentleman said this morning it was drafted. We have not got the minutes of this morning's meeting in order to clarify the point.—A. I said that they had a share in the drafting of the terms of the Balfour Declaration.

Q. Was there any immediate response, any negative response from the Arabs against the Balfour Declaration at the time it was made?—A. An immediate response was made as soon as they came to know of it. Again I would like to refer to the King-Crain report of 1919 which is a very important document, gentlemen. You should read it.

Q. But it was not published?—A. It was not published at all.

Q. Is there anything official in the way of knowledge by the public that would intimate to the world at large that the Balfour Declaration was not acceptable as a White Paper from the government having the mandate over Palestine?—A. Actually the active opposition of the Arabs to the Balfour Declaration began in 1921. There was a revolt in 1921. There was another in 1923. There was a third revolt in 1929 and another revolt in 1933. And there was one continuous revolt from 1936 to 1939.

Q. And the only alterations or corrections to it were made by the British government in the White Paper when Churchill was secretary?—A. I would like to say there were no corrections, and that these statements were mere explanations. The Balfour Declaration was a very obscure document. It was a mere expression of sympathy, that is all, sympathy with the Zionist aspirations which aspirations were not described. Nobody knew what they were; so the government of Britain had to come out with an explanation. The first explanation came officially in 1922 in the form of a paper issued by the colonial secretary.

Q. Did I understand you correctly this morning when you said that Palestine was ready to accept the world-wide scheme to absorb the overflow of Jews?—A. I said that the Arab world was; I did not say Palestine was.

Q. Would you kindly define to the committee whether the Arab world would be willing to accept, and to what extent, if possible, the overflow of Jews who are wandering all over Europe?—A. I was referring to an official statement issued by the secretary-general of the Arab League who said, in an official statement, that the Arab League was prepared to participate in a solution, on an international basis, with all the countries, to share in the relief of these Jews, and that the Arabs through the Arab League, would take their share.

Q. Would it include or incorporate Palestine?—A. The Arabs of Palestine won't accept one single immigrant, because in no country except Palestine is Jewish immigration of political significance. Palestine in this respect stands unique.

By Mr. Low:

Q. I have two or three questions to ask you. My information is that numerous Jews of Palestine settled in Tel Aviv or Haifa, perhaps in both places, and that most of them were Roman Catholic. Is that information correct?—A. I am sorry, but I have not got any information on the subject.

Q. Yes, so called Jews, and that they were Roman Catholic.—A. I am afraid that I cannot give you any information; I do not know anything about it.

Dr. KHEIRALLAH: It is very hard to understand a Jew being a Roman Catholic or a Roman Catholic being a Jew.

Mr. Low: That was a curious bit of information that came to me; I mentioned so-called Jews.

Dr. KHEIRALLAH: You mean that they passed as such.

Mr. Low: Yes, that is right.

Dr. KHEIRALLAH: There is the possibility, but I am not aware of it.

By Mr. Leger:

Q. Is there a proportion of the population of Jewish descent in Tel Aviv who are Roman Catholic?—A. Yes.

Q. And they have a Roman Catholic Church and a Roman Catholic priest?—A. I am not aware of the situation in Tel Aviv now except to say that only Jews live there.

By Mr. Low:

Q. My second question was in connection with something Mr. Leger has already brought up, regarding religious freedom in Palestine. My third question is this: There is military significance to the Jewish national policy from the point of view of the empire security. I am concerned mainly in the part which Britain has played in trying to befriend the Jews and also be fair to the Arabs. —A. This is a very serious question; I shall try to answer it by giving the facts and leaving the conclusion to you. The Near East, as you know, is a

very large area. It is inhabited by some 35,000,000 Arabs and a little over 500,000 Jews. The most important and dominant factor in that area is the Arab nationalism. These 35,000,000 Arabs realize more, every day, that they must work together.

By Mr. Graydon:

Q. That is the basis of the Arab League?—A. Exactly; with the result that in 1945, last year, that is to say, in March, the League of Arab States was established. This league was established primarily to protect and safeguard the territorial integrity of that area and to protect and safeguard the independence of the Arab states. There is no doubt in my mind that if any danger threatens the territorial integrity of any of these states, including Palestine, or its independence, it would be resisted by the 35,000,000 Arabs there. The Near East lies across the life-line of the Empire, that the British would not wish to incur the enmity of that great number of people. I would also like to remind the honourable gentlemen that certain points in this area lie very close to important Russian industrial centres. I would also like you to take into consideration that for over a century Russia has been working hard to break into warm waters, and she can only do so through the Near East. These are the factors, and I leave you to draw your own conclusions.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions?

By Mr. Jaenicke:

Q. Yes, I would like to ask a few questions. How much has the population of Palestine increased since the beginning of the century, in the last 46 years? —A. I said in my brief that in 1917, when the Balfour Declaration was issued, the number of people living in Palestine was something like 750,000. Of course, of that number, only 75,000 were Jews, and the rest were Arabs.

Q. Now we have 1,250,000 Arabs or something like that. Would you say that was due to natural increase or due to immigration?—A. Basically it was due to natural increase.

Q. How many immigrants would that include?—A. It has been calculated by the Government that the number of Arabs who came into the country as immigrants was something like 12,000.

Q. Since 1917?—A. That is right.

Q. But the claim made by the Zionists is very considerably more; do you know that?—A. I can tell you this, sir, in support of my argument, that the government in Palestine chases out any Arab immigrant which it can catch. It actually chases him out of the country, while the illegal Jewish immigrants are legalized through special immigration laws.

Q. Where do these Arab immigrants come from?—A. From the neighbouring Arab states; and I would point out that within the 12,000 I have mentioned may be included what we call seasonal immigrants.

Q. Of the irrigated areas where farming is done, what percentage would be occupied by Arabs and what percentage would be occupied by Jews?—A. Of the agricultural areas, I would say, now, the figure would be one-third owned by the Jews and two-thirds owned by the Arabs; and the one-third owned by the Jews lies in the best and the most fertile part of the country.

By Mr. Boucher:

Q. What percentage of the land in Palestine, or what value of the lands in Palestine do the Jews own, in relationship to the population?—A. One-third is owned by the Jews, and two-thirds by the Arabs, that is, of the cultivatable area.

Q. You mean of the fertile area?—A. I mean the land that could be cultivated. We have in Palestine, actually, 18 degrees of land. There are 18 categories for tax purposes. The land is divided into 18 categories, varying in fertility; and the taxes vary from one pound per dunam, in the best cultivatable area, to 12 mills in the least cultivatable area.

By Mr. Graydon:

Q. It is almost as complicated as our Canadian income tax.—A. Yes, it is very complicated.

By Mr. Boucher:

Q. What percentage of the Arabs live on, or work, or use Jewish-owned property?—A. The greatest land owner in Palestine is the Jewish Land Company. In the constitution of this company it is specifically laid down that no Arab should be employed on the land, and that this land is unsaleable.

Q. What about Jews occupying or using Arab-owned property?—A. As I said before, Arabs do not use very many Jews, because of the expense of the labour.

Q. Do they rent real estate to the Jews?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Jaenicke:

Q. There has been quite a lot of industry established in the country since the Jews came in.—A. Oh, yes.

Q. Do the Arabs manage any factories?—A. Yes, they have got their own factories, such as textiles, soap, matches; and now there is almost a boom for establishing companies for new productive developments and for new industries.

Q. How much of the industrial production is in the hands of the Jews and how much in the hands of the Arabs?—A. I suppose the greatest part of the industrial productive power of the country is in the hands of the Jews.

By the Chairman:

Q. Would that apply to all the Arab lands?—A. No.

By Mr. Jaenicke:

Q. Is that mostly situated at Tel Aviv?—A. It is situated along the coast between Haifa and Tel Aviv.

Q. That is where the Jewish industries are located.—A. Yes.

Q. Those are all Jewish?—A. All Jewish.

By Mr. Cote:

Q. Could the witness tell us briefly about the health situation in Palestine, and in Jerusalem particularly.—A. The health situation in Palestine is run like this: the government appropriation is divided into two sections; I am referring to the government health appropriation. One part is given to the Jews, who are allowed to use it according to their likes and dislikes; and the other part is given to the Arabs, when it is worked out between the Arabs and the government; so we have now a government-Arab health service, so to speak, and a Jewish health service.

Q. You mean to say that the government does not interfere in the Jewish zone?—A. Except for matters which are of public interest, it is left entirely to the Jews to do whatever they like, not only with regard to health service but also in regard to education.

By Mr. Leger:

Q. Is the amount divided half and half?—A. No, it is not; it is a definite proportion, and the Jews see to it that they get their proper share.

By Mr. Low:

Q. Is it divided pro rata, to the population?—A. I think it is, but I am not sure.

By Mr. Cote:

Q. There is not twice as much given to the Arabs, with regard to education and health, than is given to the Jews?—A. Probably there is.

By Mr. Graydon:

Q. Why was Palestine put under the mandate in the first instance?—A. Palestine was put under the mandate in consequence of the decision which is embodies, at least in principle, in article No. 22 of the Covenant of the League. The Turkish empire, which has been called the "sick man of Europe" after the outbreak of the first war, was considered by the western powers to be a semi-developed area. During the war, the Arabs, who were living within that Turkish empire, joined hands with the allies under the leadership of King Hussein; and in return for their participation in the war, they were promised that they would have their independence. After the cessation of hostilities, the mandate system was devised, according to which the Arab territory were assigned to mandate (*a*), which means that the people of those areas were developed to a degree that would warrant provisional recognition of their independence, subject only to advice and assistance. Under this mandate was to be Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Trans-jordan, and Palestine.

By Mr. Cote:

Q. I would like the witness to emphasize more the health situation, particularly since the mandate started, and also in regard to education. Could he give us a brief summary of the suitation as it now exists?—A. There is no comparison between the health conditions during the Turkish regime and health conditions under the British mandate. There has been a tremendous improvement; the main power behind this improvement is the British mandate in Palestine. It is the government of Palestine.

By Mr. Boucher:

Q. Would you say the same in regard to education?—A. There has been a tremendous improvement in education, but not to the same extent as in the health services.

By Mr. Graydon:

Q. With respect to the status of the government of Palestine at the moment, how it is set up, and what representation is there in that government of the mandatory power of the peoples who are there?—A. Palestine is ruled directly by Britain. There is no popular representation whatsoever. It is a direct administration.

By Mr. Leger:

Q. There are no Arab members of parliament?—A. No, there is no parliament, no House of Commons, no representation except in local matter.

By Mr. Boucher:

Q. You mean local administrative offices?—A. That is right. You have municipalities, for example, but even in the municipalities their power is restricted. Anything they do must be approved by the district commissioner.

By Mr. Graydon:

Q. Has there been any move on the part of the Arabs towards self-government?—A. Oh yes, from 1936 to 1939 there was a continuous revolt for the purpose of stopping immigration, and instituting self-government; and the White Paper of 1939 promised to free them. It promised that the Jewish immigration would not continue except with the consent of the Arabs; that land sale would be regulated so as to safeguard the interest of the peasant class, the falladien, and that within ten years a democratic government would be instituted in Palestine.

By Mr. Leger:

Q. Has not the White Paper been nullified?—A. For all practical purposes, the White Paper has been nullified.

By Mr. Winkler:

Q. The first witness this morning said that Mohamed has united the Arabs? —A. That is right.

Q. What Mohammedan countries lie outside of the Arab League?—A. Turkey, Persia, Afghanistan, and 90,000,000 Indians in India who are Moslems.

Q. Do you include the North African countries?—A. Yes, nearly all the Arabs there are Moslems.

Dr. KHEIRALLAH: There are 50,000,000 Moslems in China, 50,000,000 Moslems in Russia, 60,000,000 Moslems in Indonesia, and 300,000 Moslems in the Philippines.

By Mr. Côté:

Q. I would like to interject a question. Have all these people made representations to British government with regard to the Palestine issue?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you mean to say beyond the leagues?—A. Beyond the league.

Q. Could you not give us a concrete example of such a move, let us say, from Egypt, for instance?—A. Egypt is within the league.

Q. I mean beyond the league?—A. Yes, 90,000,000 Indians also made a plea to England to stop the injustice that has been inflicted on the Arabs of Palestine, to give them independence, and to stop Jewish immigration.

Q. When was that done?—A. It was done upon several occasions; I cannot give you the exact dates. I would refer you to the statement of Mr. Bevin when he announced the formation of the Anglo-American Committee, when he said in parliament; that the Palestine problem is becoming an international problem, and a matter of deep concern not only to the Aarabs but also to the 90,000,000 Moslems. That was an official statement made by Mr. Bevin last year.

Mr. WINKLER: Mr. Cote has asked the very question that I was going to ask.

Mr. GRAYDON: Great minds think alike.

Mr. COTE: Liberal minds work together.

By Mr. Winkler:

Q. Where is the Arab centre of culture.—A. Egypt is considered to be the centre of Arab culture.

Q. The witness mentioned that the standard of living has risen since 1917. What portion of the Arab population is literate today—A. There are no official figures, but I would say that 35 per cent could read and write.

Q. One of the witnesses, on the subject of tolerance, stressed the fact that the Arabs were very tolerant.—A. That's right.

Q. What attitude do the witnesses here today take either towards condoning or condemning the activities of the grand Mufti of Jerusalem?—A. Well I think I would rather ask Dr. Kheirallah to answer that question.

Dr. KHEIRALLAH: Personally, although representing the viewpoint of the Arabs, I hold no brief for the grand Mufti or for any faction, or for any individual on either side; but the majority of the Arabs during the war, as exemplified by the actions of Syria, Lebanon, Transjordania and over 90 per cent of Iraq, to say nothing of Egypt and the Moslems of other countries, were certainly pro-ally. We had nothing but the Eighth English army during the critical period in Syria and Lebanon; and had they given the least encouragement, things might have been different. But we will leave that aside. I cannot but think of Mr. Stern who went to Mussolini and came back and strengthened his hand. You would not stigmatize the Jewish race because of that

Mr. WINKLER: But the grand Mufti has returned to Egypt.

Dr. KHEIRALLAH: He is an individual. Egypt had given him shelter. Would you want to hang him? He was driven from Palestine to Lebanon where they made it hot for him; then he ran away to Iraq where he was pressed hard and ran to Persia. From there he went to Turkey where they said "We do not want you." He then ran away to the only place for him to go. I do not hold a brief for him. He is only one individual, while you have got 60,000,000 Arabs. I include North Africa as well as East Africa. You cannot condemn them all for the action of one man, or even for the action of a group. Neither would I condemn the Zionists because of the action of the extremists.

Mr. WINKLER: He is the leader of Palestine?

Dr. KHEIRALLAH: He was a leader of his people in one particular country, and he was fighting for those rights about which you have heard. He is not a leader to-day, so why bring up one individual and hang the whole thing on him. When I talk with a little heat, do not think that it is anything but a mode of expression, let us say.

Mr. WINKLER: I believe I heard you mention that he did not go to Germany.

Dr. KHEIRALLAH: No, he did not go to Germany at the start. You can drive a man to the devil or the deep sea. Maybe he will choose the devil or maybe he will jump into the sea. What has that to do with it?

Mr. WINKLER: But the German press carried the pictures.

Dr. KHEIRALLAH: I think they were promulgated here, no doubt, by the powerful Zionist organization. The pictures were such rank forgeries! There was Hitler sitting on one side, and about a mile away was the Mufti looking one way while Hitler was looking the other way. It is like the question: Have you stopped beating your wife? It matters not how you answer it!

Mr. WINKLER: Why did the German papers carry that picture?

Dr. KHEIRALLAH: They did so because they were grasping for anything to hold on to, just as every fighting man would, when he is fighting for his very existence and his life. Leave a little thing like that alone. The Mufti is only one individual. How many other instances have we had, in one place or another,

such Jews who fought against the allies among their own nationals. When those nationals fought against the allies, those Jews were soldiers in the ranks.

Mr. WINKLER: But we are talking about Palestine now, of which Jerusalem is the centre, and this is the grand Mufti of a religious organization.

Dr. KHEIRALLAH: The grand Mufti was doing what was "kosher" for every other leader we have had of the Zionists. Sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

The WITNESS: Will you allow me to make a contribution to this matter? He asked our own attitude as belonging to the intelligentsia, and will you permit me to make my own contribution? In my view the rapprochement between Hitler and the Grand Mufti is purely accidental such as the rapprochement between Churchill and Stalin was accidental.

By Mr. Graydon:

Q. What steps have been taken by the Arab people or the public rulers to repudiate the Grand Mufti, if any?—A. That is part and parcel of the main question. Why should we repudiate a man when we consider that his action at that time was a pure accident. Did the British or those who disapproved of joint action with the Communists repudiate Churchill at the time he decided to put his hand into the hand of Stalin? He had to do it. He was fighting a war. The Mufti's action has no other significance whatsoever. He is in exactly the same position to the Arabs as Churchill was to the British; he is a symbol of resistance. Whenever they feel that their existence is in danger they look to him. Now, if England is again faced with another perilous moment they would go back to Churchill.

By Mr. Cote:

Q. Would not the comparison be more apt with Laval?—A. No, it is not the same. Laval agreed to join hands with Hitler to rule France.

Q. I am sorry, but I do not think that Churchill's attitude and association with Stalin could be put on the same level as this association you are speaking of. I resent that.—A. I said one is as accidental as the other. I do not say it is comparable with it, but it is accidental. That is where the comparison is; it is purely accidental. It has all been an accident; a force majeure.

By Mr. Low:

Q. What is the attitude now of the Arabs towards a continuation of a mandate to Britain?—A. As I said before the Arabs do not recognize the Balfour Declaration, and they have never recognized and never will recognize the mandate which embodies the Balfour Declaration. They will resist both to the end.

Q. I thought that would be the answer. Now, is there now any substantial agitation on the part of Arabs against Britain's continuation of her mandate?—A. Yes. The fight from 1936 to 1939 was not only against the Balfour Declaration but also against the mandate. They were promised that within ten years from 1939 they would have an independent government.

Q. Now, does that attitude toward the mandate influence the Arabs against Britain?—A. Not in the least. We might make a distinction between the British government and the British in Palestine. The mandate may not be favoured even by the British. They say they have been entrusted with this mandate, and they have got to get the permission of those who trusted them to make alterations.

Q. The point I wanted to bring out was this: a distinction between the agitation against the mandate principle involved and against the mandatory

state?—A. There is all the difference in the world. The Arabs have not been fighting against the British, they have been fighting against the Palestine mandate as such.

Q. You recognize, of course, that Britain's position has been a difficult one?—A. Yes.

Q. And that at this moment, especially when the world is on the verge of almost anything one can imagine it would be dangerous to interfere so as to make the situation more difficult for Britain?

Dr. KHEIRALLAH: I do not think the question has been clearly answered. I am, unfortunately, the editor of a magazine which goes to the eastern world and has a small circulation here. I get the Arabian periodicals and papers. I am in touch with the foremost personalities of the Arab world as well as of the Moslem world at large. Now, I want to say here that England is the only country the Arabs look to. You will see it represented in my editorials. But this is not my opinion alone—England brought order out of chaos in the last 150 years. She found the world in a chaotic condition and by her efforts she made conditions more stable and she did not rule by the spirit of the whip; she ruled by diplomacy and decency and brought forward improvements everywhere, and we Arabs have benefited by that experience. Italy walked into Libya and out of 1,600,000 people she destroyed a million men, women and children. Now, look at the facts; why ask me? Who is the ally of Iraq—England; who is the ally of Egypt, in spite of the fact that Egypt has come of age and wants her independence—England; who is left of the Arab world who is not an ally of Britain? King Iben Saud is Britain's staunchest ally. The majority of us were brought up in American and English schools, and our viewpoint right through is pro-British and pro-American. My friend's statement about the mandate introduces a different question. We object to the continuation of the mandate as long as the mandate is motivated by this Zionist frenzy.

Mr. LEGER: The mandate was given to Great Britain by the League of Nations, was it not?

Dr. KHEIRALLAH: That was a question we slipped over. Back of it all was the wish and the will of Lloyd George and Clemenceau, and a division had been made by Sykes and Picot. That is the thing that thwarted Wilson. That is the influence that was not openly arrived at, back of the machinations. It was different. Now the whole Arab question is stabilized. The Arab world is with the English world and the English world should be for the Arabs. We realize that we are wards of her domain and she realizes we are with her. Look at her actions in India. She is going to win that sub-continent with its 400,000,000 people because she has been clean and right. Now, that is the question you wanted to ask.

Mr. Low: Yes. I want to ask also this question: if the mandate should become a United Nations Organization mandate instead of British how would the Arabs feel?

Dr. KHEIRALLAH: We would rather have Britain and we would rather have as per her specific pronouncement of 1939. She had tried to do this for twenty-five years. She had sent out thirteen royal commissions. Now here we have pressure put on England by her best friend, a man who was possibly manœuvred into asking just this personal favour of 100,000, just like I would say to my friend: "Give me a chew of tobacco."

Mr. BOUCHER: Might we for a moment forget the historical background? Could you explain to me what the Arab aspiration is if the Arab were relieved of the mandate? What would the system of government be; what would the system of control and regulation be; and what would they adopt if the mandate were removed?

Dr. KHEIRALLAH: Just the same as Syria and just the same as Lebanon; just the same as any other Arab state. And do not miss that one thing. This is where the Arab stands to-day. He says, "All right, you have 600,000 Zionists in Palestine although the English government have issued 850,000 ration cards. The Arabs say: "You are here and you are welcome; let you and me endeavour to be Palestinians. Let us have a Palestinian government." The Arab says that; Saud says you are our people, all right, but stop your aggression.

Mr. BOUCHER: What form of government would you set up?

Dr. KHEIRALLAH: Listen, if you think that the form of a man's religion or the form of his government makes him any better you are mistaken.

Mr. BOUCHER: I want to know from you what form of government you would recommend. It is a fair question.

Dr. KHEIRALLAH: I am going to answer it, but I am leading up to this point. I have seen the republican form of government in Haiti and Nicaragua and it was terrible, and I have seen enlightened royal government that was marvellous. It is not the form of government; we want a democratic government. Any man who takes the word and thinks that by the mere mention of the words "democratic government" it becomes a holy sort of thing or a good thing—or because it is a republican form of government—

Mr. BOUCHER: I did not mention a democratic form of government or a republic form of government or a royal form of government. I simply asked a question. I would like to know what form of government set-up you would have if there was no mandate?

Dr. KHEIRALLAH: We would have a republican government.

Mr. COTE: Has that ever been expressed by the people in your country—that you would like to establish a republic?

Dr. KHEIRALLAH: They have repeatedly stated that they wanted a representative government of all the people who were living in Palestine, who are Palestinians, regardless of whether they be christians, Jewish or Moslems.

Mr. LOW: What is the attitude of the Arabs generally toward Communism?

Dr. KHEIRALLAH: No good.

Mr. LOW: Do they actively oppose it, visibly?

Dr. KHEIRALLAH: No, but they are not Communists. They have never been Communists. It is not in their grain. They have been liberal. When you talk about democracy, I think the Arabs are the most democratic people in the world. They believe in personal freedom and initiative and cooperation, but they are not Communists.

Mr. LOW: If I remember correctly, when the Zionists spokesmen were here last week one of them stated that by all means the Zionists wished to have the mandate transferred from Britain to the United Nations Organization. Now could you suggest any implications in that?

Dr. KHEIRALLAH: Not unless they thought New York was going to run it.

The WITNESS: Actually we do not believe that the United Nations will ever approve the present mandate system in Palestine unless they really wish to commit the same mistake that the League of Nations committed. As I have explained in my brief there is a distinct contradiction between the provisions of the mandate in Palestine and that article which gave sanction to the mandate, article 22. In the mandate for Palestine the provisions are direct contradiction with the basic principle of the mandate. The mandate says that the independence of that territory is provisionally recognized, that they ought to be subject only to advice and assistance, not to uprooting, not to the substitution

by other people from the outside. It is only to give advice and assistance [redacted] do not think that after twenty-five or thirty years of miserable experience in Palestine the United Nations will ever approve such a thing.

By Mr. Leger:

Q. Would you want to have your own government and be a member of the commonwealth?—A. A Palestine democratic government in which everybody who is a Palestinian citizen will share equally in the privileges and responsibilities of that country.

By Mr. Boucher:

Q. Have you any concrete proposal with regard to a democratic government?—A. We have said in the main that we have achieved democracy in so many parts of Arabia and they are capable of achieving it in Palestine. They have achieved it in Egypt and Iraq; they have achieved real democracy in Lebanon and in Syria and there is no reason why they should not be able to achieve it in Palestine.

Q. Probably you would attempt to go further than your friend did in answer to my question. Forget the history and give me an outline of what you think the Arabs ambition is as to a form of democratic government and how that form would be constituted. Could you do that?—A. Yes. The details of such a scheme have never been worked. It would, I imagine, be worked out by a representative assembly. They would sit down and draw up a constitution.

Q. Have you done anything to express the wishes or the will of the Arab in that regard by some concrete form?—A. No, the details of such a scheme have never been worked out.

By Mr. Cote:

Q. Is such a scheme as has been pointed out by my colleague in the mind of the Moslem world; a scheme of organizing the Moslem world into a block of nations?—A. There is no idea in the mind of Moslems at present to form a block of their own. The Arabs make a clear distinction between the Arab movement and the Moslem movement. The Arabs are not all Moslems.

Q. I know that.—A. We have a great number of people who are non-Moslems.

By Mr. Leger:

Q. How many?—A. In Egypt there are something like 2,000,000 christian Copts.

By Mr. Cote:

Q. It is a small percentage.—A. 2,000,000 out of 15,000,000 Moslems. There is a small minority in Syria and a majority of christians in Lebanon and a They all participate in the government on an equal footing with the Moslem small minority in Palestine and there is another christian minority in Iraq. Arabs and they do not consider themselves a national minority.

Q. Is there any movement on foot to prepare, with the cooperation of Palestine, an organization that would speak louder to the U.N.O. or anywhere else where a separate representation could be made, if representation is being accorded to any of the countries?—A. I do not understand your question.

Q. If there is self-government in Palestine and if there is self-government elsewhere in the Arab world, is there on foot anything in the way of organizing a block of nations?—A. Arab nations?

Q. Yes.—A. Oh, yes. You see it now with the program of the Palestinians—and I would say that the majority of Palestinians are Arabs—it is therefore their program to join the Arab League as soon as they become independent.

Mr. JAQUES: Could I ask a question?

The CHAIRMAN: Certainly.

Mr. JAQUES: I have not got the record, but did the Zionists tell us what sort of constitution they would have?

The CHAIRMAN: I think it is on the record. They gave some answer.

Mr. JAQUES: I do not remember it. I do not remember the question being asked.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, the question was asked and answered.

Rabbi SCHWARTZ: Do you mean what kind of constitution they would have for the Jewish state? Definitely democratic.

Mr. JAQUES: What do you call democratic?

Rabbi SCHWARTZ: In the sense of one man one vote.

Mr. JAQUES: Do you call the Russian system democratic?

Rabbi SCHWARTZ: No.

Mr. JAQUES: Do you call it a socialist country?

Rabbi SCHWARTZ: England to-day is partially socialist and she is democratic.

Mr. JAQUES: It is not socialist.

Rabbi SCHWARTZ: They call it socialist.

Mr. JAQUES: It is not socialist yet.

Rabbi SCHWARTZ: Not entirely. What the Zionist movement has had in mind from the beginning as to what the Jewish homeland will be is a government in which there will be one man one vote. There is no question about that. Full rights for minorities with their recognition.

Mr. JAQUES: One party?

Rabbi SCHWARTZ: No, not in Palestine. As a matter of fact in the Jewish community in Palestine we have a dozen parties—too many. Full rights for minorities, recognition for Arab culture and opportunity to develop Arab culture. I have a document here—a resolution adopted only last summer in London—on this question. "The Jewish state will be based upon full equality of rights of all inhabitants without distinction of religion or race in the political, civic, religious, and national domains, and without domination or subjection. All communities will enjoy full autonomy in the administration of their religious, educational, cultural, and social institutions." This was an official statement of the Zionist movement in August 1945 at a meeting held in London.

Mr. JAQUES: That is provided the Jews have a majority in Palestine.

Rabbi SCHWARTZ: Naturally. You could not have a Jewish state unless you had a Jewish majority.

Mr. JAQUES: You would not want independence in Palestine until the Jews reached a majority?

Rabbi SCHWARTZ: We would not want Jewish independence until we had a majority?

Mr. JAQUES: Yes.

Rabbi SCHWARTZ: I think we will be willing to wait until we are a majority, and we want such conditions existing which will enable us to become a majority.

The WITNESS: I would like to ask a question. Here is a gentleman who claims to be a democrat. This is a great opportunity for me to ask him a question. Would he go now as a representative of the Zionist organization with a demand to be served on England jointly with the Arabs to the effect that we have a democratic government now?

Rabbi SCHWARTZ: What is that?

The WITNESS: Would you join together with me and all Arabs n[illegible] a communication to the Prime Minister of England demanding the im[illegible]iate institution of a democratic government in Palestine?

Rabbi SCHWARTZ: Provided—

The WITNESS: With no provisions, now?

Rabbi SCHWARTZ: Provided it allowed for Jewish immigration up to the absorptive capacity of the country as indicated in the Churchill white paper of 1922. The Arabs would remain. We believe there is no need for Arab immigration because they have vast territories. There will be no problem there. Such conditions of democratic institutions in Palestine would allow for one condition. There would be an opportunity for Jewish immigration to come to Palestine, up to the absorptive capacity of the country, in accordance with the Balfour Declaration and mandate, and the White Paper of 1922.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Rabbi SCHWARTZ: We stick to the mandate and the Balfour Declaration. We are not ready to abandon the Balfour Declaration and the mandate. That is the official policy of the Zionist organization at the present moment; and to-day, at this moment, the Balfour Declaration is the mandate upon which our rights are founded. We stick to it and we do not ask for its abandonment.

Mr. JAQUES: We have not got the record, but I remember asking a question with respect to the White Paper and it was said that the interpretation put on the White Paper here was the issue, I mean to say, the Balfour Declaration.

Mr. GRAYDON: That is to say, the 1917 declaration.

Mr. JAQUES: That is right; that the interpretation put on it in 1917 is very different to the interpretation which is put on it in 1946.

The WITNESS: That is right.

Mr. JAQUES: What is the Balfour Declaration? Is it the declaration as it was issued in 1917, or is it the interpretation put upon it by the Zionists or anybody else in 1946? The only declaration I know was the one issued in 1917, not the interpretation put upon it to-day. I have a few questions to ask the witness.

The CHAIRMAN: Certainly, it would be in order.

By Mr. Graydon:

Q. Can you tell me how many Palestine Jews served in the War?—A. The figure given by the Jews, so far as I remember, is 25,000; I do not know what proportion of that figure were women and what proportion were men. When I say women, I mean in the non-combatant forces.

Q. It is claimed that the British prevented the Jews from raising an army.—A. That is not true; there were no restrictions whatsoever upon volunteers from either the Arabs or the Jews in Palestine. I myself was responsible for recruiting Arab volunteers at the time and I remember that we raised 13,000. A good number, in view of the fact that for the three years immediately before the outbreak of the war, there was a revolt which lasted for three years, in which the Arabs lost not less than 15,000 men in dead alone.

Q. Was Palestine included in the Hussein Agreement?—A. Yes, definitely. We Arabs claim that Palestine was definitely included in the pledges that were given by the British government. I would remind you gentlemen that the pledges of McMahon to King Hussein were given two years before the Balfour Declaration. Actually the only territory excluded from the terms submitted by King Hussein to Sir McMahon was the territory now known as Lebanon where the French, because of the Christian majority there, were interested. Actually, King Hussein in his reply said that because he felt he ought to preserve concord between Britain and her ally, France, he would agree to the

exclusion of this area. It was excluded on account of that, although it was really Arab territory; and King Hussein said, that after the war the people of that country will be consulted and if they wish to join in an Arab state, very well; otherwise they can remain excluded therefrom.

Q. How much have the Arabs profited by the Zionist hospitals, and universities?—A. Very little, almost negligibly. I have already explained, there are two health systems in Palestine, one which is purely Jewish and the other which is English-Arab, that is, the system which is the government's health service. Actually, the number of Jews who avail themselves of the service of this government institution is far greater than the number of Arabs who benefit from the Jewish hospitals. Very few but wealthy people could afford to pay for the Hadassah hospital in Jerusalem. The charges for an operation of appendectomy is something like £75. ($300) that is something very few Arabs can afford to pay.

By Mr. Graydon:

Q. You do not mean that the Jews make a distinction in the way of costs of hospitalization between Jews and Arabs?—A. Oh yes.

Q. Do they charge the Arabs more?—A. There is a special section in the Hadassah hospital for free treatment which is confined to Jews.

Q. Well, it would be a Jewish institution?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Low:

Q. Have you a hospital of your own?—A. We have an Arab-government institution, we do not complain.

By Mr. Graydon:

Q. But by way of fairness, I do not think you want to leave the impression that there is a discrimination in so far as paying patients are concerned?—A. Oh, yes, the Arab pays more than the Jew in the Hadassah hospital.

Q. For the same operation?—A. For the same operation.

Q. Does the Jew pay more than an Arab in an Arab institution?—A. Health appropriation is divided into two parts; one part is given to the Jews and the other is managed by the government. This other service which is run by the government is mainly an Arab one, staffed by Arab doctors, intended primarily for the service of Arab people; but the number of Jews who avail themselves of the services of this Arab-government institution is far greater than the number of Arabs who have benefited from the Jewish institution, the treatment to all is free.

By the Chairman:

Q. Is there any discrimination against Jews in the Arab hospitals?—A. No, there is none whatsoever.

Q. You maintain there is in the other hospital?—A. There is, definitely, a discrimination. In the Hadassah hospital there is a free section to which the Arab is not allowed; and in the other section of the hospital to which the Arab may go, the Arab has to pay as much as £75 for an appendectomy operation.

By Mr. Jaenicke:

Q. To what extent are Jewish hospitals subsidized by the government?—A. I do not know, but I do know that they take their full share from the government appropriation. Of course, they are subsidized by private funds.

Mr. JAENICKE: I would like to get some information upon education.

The CHAIRMAN: If we could just let Mr. Jaques finish.

By Mr. Jaques:

Q. I shall include the schools.—A. The medium of expression that there is Hebrew, so we do not use the schools because we do not know Hebrew.

By Mr. Cote:

Q. What system of education do both groups have?—A. I would refer you to the section of the Anglo-American Committee's report dealing with education. The education system, like the health system, is divided in two. There is a Jewish system of education and a government system. The government system is run by the Arabs and the government, but the other system is exclusively Jewish.

By Mr. Jaenicke:

Q. Is the Jewish system subsidized by the government?—A. Oh yes.
Q. Have you a university in Palestine?—A. There is a Hebrew university.
Q. Is it run by the Jews?—A. Yes.
Q. And is paid for by the Jew?—A. Yes.
Q. Is it subsidized by the government?—A. Partly.
Q. Can Arabs attend that university?—A. They can go to that university, but the medium of expression is Hebrew and they do not know Hebrew.

By the Chairman:

Q. Is there any university in Arabia?—A. In Arabia we have many universities, but none in Palestine. We have three universities in Cairo, and two universities in Beirut.

By Mr. Cote:

Q. What is the highest school grade you have in Palestine?—A. It is the high school.

Q. You have no secondary schools?—A. Yes, we have; that is the secondary school, it prepares for matriculation.

By Mr. Jaques:

Q. What about the increase in the Jewish population; does that raise the standard of living of the Arab population?—A. I think I have answered that before; I think I said there was a rise in the standard of living of the Arabs, but that it was due to factors which are entirely beyond the control of Zionism, and was primarily due to the impact of ideas between the east and the west, due to the interchange of commerce, the interchange of trade, and to increased productivity throughout the Arab countries.

Q. With regard to the population, has there been an increase in population in the other parts of Arabia as well?—A. Oh yes; there have been increases all through Arabia; almost double in Transjordan since 1917; they have trebled in Egypt since 1880; and there has been an increase in Iraq, Syria and Lebanon.

Q. The statement was made here the other day that owing to the improved standard of living in Palestine, the Jewish population had increased.—A. The Jewish population increased due to immigration.

Q. But you say that the Arab population has increased in other parts?—A. Oh yes, throughout the Arab country, almost the same ratio.

Q. But it is not due to Zionism?—A. Oh no, it has nothing to do with that.

Q. It is not due to their administration?—A. I do not suppose they are trying to link up our fertility with Zionism; that would be too much to claim of them.

Q. Would you, very briefly, tell us the difference between the Jewish national home, the Jewish national state, and the Jewish national common-

wea[illegible]—A. The Jewish state and the commonwealth are the same, I take it; but the Jewish national home is different, at least, according to the understanding of the British government, who are the authors of the Balfour Declaration. They have described the Jewish national home rather in detail. I shall read it again if the committee is interested.

By the Chairman:

Q. But you read it this morning.—A. Oh yes.

Q. We will have it in the record anyway.—A. If you like I can state it in brief.

By Mr. Jaques:

Q. The whole case to me, as I see it, stands or falls on that promise. If I remember correctly, they promised a national home "in" Palestine, not "all" Palestine; it was "in" Palestine.—A. Yes, that was explained in detail in the Churchill Command Paper of 1922.

Q. We hear so much about the Zionist side and so very little about the Arab side of this question.—A. Yes.

Q. I mean, generally, in the press and over the air and everywhere.—A. I think this is a very important question, sir, and I would like to answer it in more detail. I think it would serve a more important purpose if I referred to the United States of America. You are probably aware there are something like 1,000,000 Americans of Arab extraction, and something like 5,000,000 to 6,000,000 Jews in the United States of America. Americans of Arab extraction, when they live in a country, acquire the citizenship of that country. They owe all their loyalty and allegiance to that country; they have nothing but sympathy for that country. They have no loyalty otherwise. I think this is not the case with the Zionist Jews in America. They have been vociferously agitating for the creation of a Jewish state on the plea that they were homeless.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think I would like to allow that statement to go unchallenged because I know, from my own experience, as a Canadian, that the allegiance of the Jewish people to our country is very, very great. They are very, very loyal.—A. If you would allow me, Sir, I have said this only to present the next point. I say that the plea of Zionism is to create a home for homeless Jews.* Now, I ask you, gentlemen, if a Jew who is living in the United States of America, or a Jew living in Canada, has got no home, then who has? If a Jew living in Europe has got no home, or a Jew living in England has got no home, or a Jew living in France has got no home, then who has got a home? I ask you? Who has got a home? Why should a Zionist living in France, or in Canada, or even in Germany, or anywhere on the face of the earth where he is treated on the basis of equality with the citizens of that country need a home? Why on earth should he need a home? Has he not already got his home?

By Mr. Graydon:

Q. I would like to ask you this: I do not think the Jewish people are asking for a home.—A. But I said the Zionists.

Q. All right, I will substitute the word "Zionists". I do not think the Zionists have in mind bringing Jews from places where they have homes to-day. You have referred to places in Central Europe where the persecution of Jews has been very great.—A. Excuse me, sir, Zionism existed before Hitler; it existed when the Zionists were living in Germany on an equal footing with the Germans; it existed in Czechoslovakia where the Jews were living on equal footing with Czechoslovakians. Even at that time they held the claim that they needed a national home.

Q. I was just thinking of what the Jewish witnesses said here. The Zionists put their case before the war that the Jews need a national home. They do not make a distinction between Jews who live in Poland, Jews who live in Czechoslovakia, or Jews who live in the United States of America.

By Mr. Cote:

Q. I would like the witness to clarify my mind with regard to the Zionist organization. I have always had the impression that the Zionist organization was an organization to counteract what is known all over the world as anti-semitism. The history of anti-semitism is, I am sure, well known to all the members of this committee and as being a sort of Hitlerism towards Jews all over the world. If I am not right, I would like to be corrected. Is not the Zionist organization somehow trying, all over the world, to counteract that idea of anti-semitism? Wherever persecution took place the Zionist organization would come out and say, "We will see to it that those of our people who are being persecuted here and there should at least have a land where they can go and live forever after as free men." That is the idea I have always held, and I would like to have it clarified.—A. There has been a lot of debate on the question of Zionism. For a clear and true picture of it I would refer you to a book written by Rabbi Berger, and to the many writings of Rabbi Rosenwald, who is the head of the American Council for Judaism, where he explains that Zionism is injurious to the interests of Jews. It is a national movement which strikes at the roots of loyalty of the Jews wherever they are. These are the words of a great and learned man, whom, I think, should be treated as an authority on the question.

Q. I appreciate your suggestions, of which I will take advantage; but my question is: Am I right or wrong when I think that the Zionist Society is an organization to counteract anti-semitism in the world?—A. I do not know about the Zionist Society. If they are truly Zionists they mean this: that they work for the building up of a nation on the basis of race and religion. This is really the essence of Zionism; it is purely a national movement built upon concepts of race and religion.

Q. That is the positive factor of it; how about the negative one; is it not anti-semitism? I am sure you have heard a lot about it in the world; I want to be clarified because I know you have more knowledge of it than I have. Am I correct in thinking this organization is aimed at counteracting the activities of anti-semitism in the world?—A. I would say that part of its activity, I believe, is to counteract anti-semitism, but it is not the main purpose of the society.

By Mr. Jaques:

Q. Would somebody, either Zionist or Arab, define semitism and define anti-semitism? That is something about which I would like to have a clear definition.—A. I would like to ask the Rabbi to explain it.

Rabbi SCHWARTZ: I do not think I should be asked. The Jews are the victims of anti-semitism. I cannot see the fairness of that question being addressed to a Jew. However, I think anti-semitism is an attempt to discriminate against the Jew and make it impossible for him to enjoy equal rights with his co-inhabitants in any particular country.

Mr. JAQUES: Would you say that there is anti-semitism in Canada?

Rabbi SCHWARTZ: According to press reports I understand there is.

Mr. JAQUES: According to the press?

Rabbi SCHWARTZ: According to what I hear or am told; according to my knowledge of certain aspects of life in Canada there is unfortunately, in certain parts of Canada, anti-semitism.

Mr. JAQUES: Was there any anti-semitism to speak of before Hitler?

Rabbi SCHWARTZ: There was anti-semitism before Hitler, but perhaps not so much. But there was a measure.

Mr. JAQUES: Hitler has got nothing to do with Canada.

Mr. LEGER: You have your right to elect members of parliament and to vote.

Rabbi SCHWARTZ: Jews enjoy full and equal rights in Canada. The problem of anti-semitism is that there are certain individuals and groups in this democratic country who would like to deprive Jews of those equal rights.

Mr. LEGER: There are some people who would like to put down the Jews?

Rabbi SCHWARTZ: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. If I may be allowed at this stage—I hope it is relevant, because I do not want to curtail discussion at this time. But we are now dealing with the Palestine question.

Mr. JAQUES: It is the whole basis of the claim.

Mr. WINKLER: Does not semitism include the semites as well as the Arabs?

By Mr. Jaques:

Q. The Arabs are a semitic people.—A. That is right. Actually, we Arabs are more semitic than most of the Jews.

Q. But anti-semitism does not apply to the Arabs.—A. There must be something wrong. I do not know why. If people are really anti-semitic, they must also hate the Arabs. I do not know which is correct.

Q. Can you define semitism, speaking as an Arab?—A. To me it has no significance at all. I am a semitic, but I do not think anybody is trying to rob me of my rights, except in Palestine.

By Mr. Winkler:

Q. Are Syrians or Armenians classed as semites?—A. Syrians, yes.

By the Chairman:

Q. The witness spoke of the Jews wanting a national home. It would be a natural instinct for that fine race to want a national home on account of their historical background and on account of the fact that they had kingdoms and national homes and governments at one time. In fact, they had two kingdoms; and it is natural for them to want a national home. I would mention the Jews in France. We have no attachment to France, but we do know there is a centre of culture there which means something, not only to us, but to the rest of the world; and it would be a natural thing for the Jewish people, eventually, to want a national home, no matter how small or how large it may be. I would like the witness to say that he is tolerant on that point and is not set against a national home for the Jewish people.—A. I think the Arabs have made it clear on all occasions that they have no objection to the Jews having a cultural and social centre in Palestine, a cultural centre of which they can be proud and to which they can contribute; but the Arabs will not tolerate political ambition; they will not allow an alien people to come in and dominate them politically in their own country and reduce them to a minority in an alien state because they believe that no other people on earth would tolerate it and they are just as human as anybody. They have no objections, however, to the establishment of a cultural centre or a social centre in which they could take pride and to which they could contribute.

Q. What would be the attitude of your people? In our discussion we must always keep in mind that the only nation in the world, during, let us say, twelve centuries that has tried to solve the Jewish question has been the British nation, the English-speaking countries. That is in their favour in the eyes of the world.

It is a mooted question; it is a very very intricate question. What would be your attitude towards eventual zoning in Palestine?—A. As I said before, gentlemen, I am speaking in my own personal capacity; I do not represent any organization, but I have a feeling that there is no desire whatsoever on the part of the Arabs to dominate—and I expressly stress the word "dominate"—the Jews in Palestine; but the Arabs do have every intention of preserving their territorial integrity of their country. There is a distinction. The Jewish community may enjoy local self-government in Palestine to an extent that will not conflict with the principle of the territorial integrity of Palestine. We have no desire to dominate their local affairs. We have no desire to tell them how to run their own local affairs in their towns, villages, and settlements; but it is essential, and I think you will all see my point, that the territorial integrity of Palestine should be preserved. Within that principle the Arabs would not object to giving them local self-government.

By Mr. Cote:

Q. How do you define "integrity of territory"?—A. The Arabs would not agree to a separate state in Palestine.

The CHAIRMAN: One who studies impartially the Palestine question will hardly fail to realize what you stated so fairly and broadmindedly, that the Jewish population have been of material benefit to the whole of Palestine, that they brought with them the characteristics of their race, thrift and industry, that they benefit the interests of the rest of the country, both Zionist and Christian through the money, the tremendous sums of money, that were contributed towards the success of their movement. It might be due to the threat of the Arabic countries, but it has been maintained time and time again. It is not a prejudice of mine or any member of this committee. Generally speaking the Arabs are naturally nomads due to their geographical position. They are not particularly interested in industry. I do not mean they are not thrifty or industrious as a lot of people are led to believe, but the suggestion is made that they get into competition with the Jewish world and that they are not ready or willing to carry the pace with them in industrialization or as regards the new code of living in our present civilization.

The WITNESS: I wish to correct a few statements—

The CHAIRMAN: They are not statements. This has been said.

The WITNESS: Yes. You have said the Jews introduced industry to the country, but I do not think in the long run or taking the long view that the Arabs materially have benefited from the Jewish schemes.

The CHAIRMAN: But the country has.

The WITNESS: Yes, the country, but what of the people? When you speak of Canada as a country primarily you mean the people of Canada. If the development of Canada is not for the benefit of the inhabitants of Canada that development I would say is definitely undesirable. Unless it is for the benefit of the people of Canada you are not going to allow the United States of America to bring capital into Canada to make it a paradise for the people of the United States of America; you want them to come to help you to develop the country for your own benefit. I say and I maintain that the Zionist scheme in Palestine has never been designed for the benefit of the inhabitants of Palestine. They have a closed economy for the benefit of that section of the people of Palestine known as the Jews. It was planned solely for that purpose. As I said before it was stated in the Crane-King Commission interviews with Zionist leaders that they (Zionists) plan to dispossess the Arabs of Palestine.

By Mr. Cote:

Q. Was it not published in the New York Times also?—A. Yes. I can send a copy to you if you like. I have a photostat copy.

Q. Was it not published in the New York Times?—A. I think it was published in the New York Times.

By Mr. Leger:

Q. The members of this committee have asked numerous questions with a view to having the Canadian public enlightened on the Arab problem as well as on the Zionist or Jewish problem. We also asked numerous questions of the Jewish representatives. I wish to personally thank you very kindly for the information you have given us to-day.—A. Thank you very much. We appreciate and we are very grateful for this privilege of appearing before this august body.

Mr. JAQUES: I have one question I would like to ask.

By Mr. Jaques:

Q. What would you regard as Canada's responsibility in regard to Palestine?—A. We are discussing to-day in a committee of the House of Commons the Palestine question, and I think it is pertinent to ask how Canada comes into this matter.

Mr. COTE: I think it is easy to understand. I will ask the chairman to explain. I think the world has shrunk, and the time has gone for England or the U.N.O. or any other international organization to decide on the Palestine issue unless we are consulted.

The CHAIRMAN: And to do our duty we have to be well informed on this subject. These meetings have been a privilege to us.

The WITNESS: The privilege is ours. There are legal responsibilities which bind Canada to this question. As you may know the Canadian government has been a signatory to the covenant of the League of Nations; they have a responsibility with regard to the Palestine question as part of the mandate. In that section which your government has signed, gentlemen, there is a specific obligation. You are among those who recognize the provisional independence of Palestine. That was in 1922, and it is your responsibility, gentlemen, to see that that responsibility is carried out.

Mr. LEGER: Are you fully aware that the order of reference given to this committee does not permit us to make a report to the House of what we have heard either from the Zionists or from the Arabs?

The CHAIRMAN: It is recorded then in the record.

Mr. LEGER: Our order of reference does not permit us to make a report. The only thing is, we will have that on our record. That is all.

By Mr. Jaques:

Q. With regard to General Morgan's statement, what is the usual condition of Jewish refugees arriving in Palestine?—A. Would you allow me to ask Dr. Kheirallah, if he could answer that.

Dr. KHEIRALLAH: I think, gentlemen, you have all read about General Morgan and how he has been villified, although he was a man of great accomplishment and true sincerity. You will remember that they tried to throw him out and the press, under the thumb of certain people who pay for the advertisement, villified him. You know as much about it as I do. Really the question should not be asked. I leave it to you.

Mr. JAQUES: When did these Jewish refugees arrive in Palestine?

Dr. KHEIRALLAH: The whole scheme, ever since the war, has been that the Zionists have been permitted to go and run through all the camps everywhere and to encourage and promote these people by telling them there is no place open for them to go to but Palestine, where we will do this and do that for you. I had a discussion with the president of the Zionist organization, Dr. Goldstein, and with Mr. MacDonald. They both stressed the point of the desire of these people, and both men had gone through the camps. What I said to Mr. MacDonald over the radio, slowly and specifically is this, that to desire a thing or to covet it is not a sufficient reason to possess it. And this is the case. When General Morgan saw them coming, by the hundreds and the thousands, he saw the situation and felt it to be his duty to state the facts, for this he was villified beyond measure. It has been a very nasty sort of fight. We semites have been villified, by the Zionist and have let go. We say: "May the Lord take care of the hindmost."

The CHAIRMAN: Are you finished with your questioning, Mr. Jaques?

Mr. JAQUES: I think so, yes.

By Mr. Jaenicke:

Q. I should like to have a short explanation of the system of taxes in Palestine?—A. There are both direct and indirect taxes. The direct taxes are such things as customs and income tax, and there are also agricultural taxes.

Q. Are there land taxes?—A. Yes, it is called there the rural property tax. For the purpose of taxes, land in Palestine has been divided into eighteen categories according to fertility, and each category has to pay taxes so much per dunam.

Q. Is that the largest source of revenue, that tax?—A. No, direct taxes are by far the heavier source of revenue.

Q. Is there an income tax?—A. There is an income tax and there is customs.

The CHAIRMAN: They have a high degree of civilization there as well.

By Mr. Jaenicke:

Q. The income tax is mostly borne by industry?—A. No, it is paid according to income. Even the government officers have to pay it. I had to pay it, and everyone has to make an annual declaration of his income according to the law.

Q. What would be the years' budget at the present time?—A. Last year it was something like £18,000,000.

Q. What would it be for the year 1917?—A. It was very small.

Q. Would you venture to guess?—A. I would not venture a guess; it was much smaller then.

By Mr. Cote:

Q. That means that there is a tremendous increase in the national wealth?—A. No, there was this change during the wartime; to a certain extent, yes, but what I meant to say was that it does not mean a proportionate increase in the wealth for example, the government budget before the war was something like £7,000,000 or £8,000,000; whereas now it is around £18,000,000. The increase is due to inflation and not increase in national wealth.

Q. It has more than doubled.—A. There was inflation; the rise of the budget was due to inflation of money, and that is explained by the fact that a lot of fiat money had to be issued during the war, with the result that the cost of living rose. It is a very complicated matter. You cannot say that because during the war taxes have doubled, your budget has doubled, that there was double capacity of the country. It does not follow.

By the Chairman:

Q. You do not know the answer about the Arabs being nomads and primitive?—A. Only a small section of the Arabs of Palestine live in the nomadic state; they are treated by the government statisticians as a constant figure and have been so treated for the past ten years. They number some 50,000. They do not increase or decrease;

The CHAIRMAN: I believe that one of our members, Mr. Leger, has already expressed the general sentiment of our committee by way of appreciation of your presence here and your fine behaviour and delivery. As Mr. Leger has said, we have no power of recommendation in our committee on External Affairs; but we have the power to report everything said. Consequently, everything said here will be reported and mentioned in our report. It was one of the finest national forums one could have on behalf of both sides, to provide them with the opportunity of voicing both sides of the question. Both sides loyally recognize what Great Britain has done in the matter, and they realize the sacrifices. She was the only nation to attempt to tackle the intricate problem. I, for one, believe it will be possible to find a solution. I am not a married man, but I believe marriage owes much of its success to compromise.

I would thank all the members of this committee, not only for their patience, but for the interest they have shown in our deliberations. It is our intention to proceed as quickly as we can with our report which is in embryo form at the present time. I would not take upon myself the responsibility of formulating it; but if you will leave it to me, I shall call a general meeting of all the committee in order to discuss what should be included in that report. I offer a tentative date at this time, which will likely be half past eleven next Tuesday. Thank you again.

Dr. KHEIRALLAH: And we thank you, sir.

The committee adjourned at 5.50 p.m., to meet again at the call of the chair.

APPENDIX A

The following questions are rendered by H. W. Winkler M.P. of the External Affairs Standing Committee of the House of Commons and answered by Herbert A. Mowat, Executive Secretary of the Canadian Palestine Committee.

1. On British Security in the Middle East.

What would be the effect of a strong Jewish national home of the British position in the Middle East from the point of view of security?

A.—It is claimed on the highest level of military authority that the security factor of the British Imperial Policy in the Middle East would be best served of a progressive and flourishing National Home or State for the Jewish people. It is claimed that the late High Commissioner of Palestine, the Late Field Marshal Lord Gort, leaned strongly to this view.

The strategical concept of a strong Jewish community in Palestine has been developed in detail by W. E. Hart, a British military correspondent, who has written a brochure on the subject entitled *Defence of the Middle East*. The introduction to the brochure is written by General Sir G. Le Q. Martel, K.C.B., D.S.O. etc. late Director of Armoured Warfare in the British Army and Chairman of the British Military Mission to Russia in 1942. He accepts the author's view as worthy of the most serious consideration. The following from *Defence of the Middle East* is worthy of special mention:

> . . . strategical problems ought to help us to understand the most pressing and urgent problem of the Palestine of today that is the immigration policy. To discontinue full immigration into Palestine means to deny to the British Empire the finest recruiting material that could be found in the Middle East. Why should Jewish immigration be stopped or limited to a minimum? Because Arabian interests have to be safeguarded? Because Arabian activities might in reply to a full immigration policy disturb the peace of the Middle East? Because the Arabian section might be inclined to put their own immediate interests higher than those of the British Empire? The questions carry their own answers.
>
> Why does not the Arabian world itself endeavour to produce an industry and a population with conditions that would make possible the installation of an almost self-sufficient defence force? The reason is not only that they are incapable of doing so, but that they have no interest in seeing a strong British Middle East position in the military field.
>
> No one could mistake sporadic outburst by Jewish extremists for a general pan-Zionistic or other fantastic scheme. They are signs that already a negligable proportion of the Jewish population in Palestine are discontented and are mistakenly irritated into using the wrong language, that of violence.
>
> Here lies the difference between the Arab and Jewish community in this region: the first (Arab) has always sought development outside the framework of the Empire; the second has never schemed or planned any future except within that Empire . . . . The cut in Jewish immigration into Palestine means a reduction in manpower necessary for the defence of the Middle East. Or can there be any suggestion that a large majority of the manpower and recruiting material that has come into that part of the Empire—well-educated and highly civilized people—could be found anywhere else in Europe or America? Hardly an Englishman or an American, unless he is a Zionist, could be induced to settle in Palestine

for its better defence . . . . Why does not the Arab section (of Pa[illegible]ae) produce the technically minded majority? Does any sensible re[illegible]ing officer recommend an illiterate man for an anti-tank crew, as the driver of a Sherman tank, or an air observer?

Any enemy of the British Empire, realizing that he would face in his attack on Suez and Alexandria some three or four locally recruited armoured divisions and even a comparatively small force of airborne troops plus trained desert and machanized infantry, will hesitate and may well be deterred.

2. Q. The American stake in the Middle East.

What are the stakes of the United States in the Middle East at present and how are they related to the question of Zionism?

A. The high-ranking officers responsible for the planning of United States security already have been protesting vigorously that the war was won by the burning up of western hemisphere oil reserves to the great advantage of the eastern hemisphere oil reserves. The greatest oil reserves of the world are in the region of the Persian Gulf and they contend that American policy in the Middle East must be as realistic as the needs of the greatest oil-burning power of the world require. Persian Gulf reserves are said to be close to 100,000,000,000 barrels (one hundred billion barrels) as compared to less than 40,000,000,000 barrels under the control of U.S.A. in the western hemisphere. Forty per cent of the oil of the Persian Gulf area is under the territories of Saudi Arabia and the Standard of California and Gulf Oil have a concession on these reserves of oil which started in 1933 and runs until 1999. In addition the United States controls 23 per cent of the oil reserves of Iraq, and 50 per cent of the reserves in Kuwait. The United States is more heavily interested in the Persian Gulf region than is Great Britain, from the point of view of the magnitude of oil resources potential within the concessions of United States oil corporations.

The policy of the oil corporations has been that of appeasement of the local Arab rulers, to get the oil out of the country on a royalty basis with a minimum of political friction. They therefore advise appeasement of the Arab rulers, even at the cost of liquidating the National Home for the Jewish people as the price of Arab conciliation. The spectre of a western hemisphere dry of oil while there is still an abundance of oil reserves in the eastern hemisphere still haunts the General Staff at Washington, and the maintenance at all costs of the United States title to these Persian Gulf oil reserves depends, at the moment on the strength of the British position in the Middle East, just as the resources of the British in the Pacific area or zone is to-day guaranteed by the ascendancy of American military power in the Pacific. The American problem at the moment is to what extent she will underwrite the British policy in the Middle East in general, and in Palestine in particular, especially in collaboration with Britain on the matter of a settlement in Palestine satisfactory to Britain's original pro-Zionist policy of 1917. The present negotiations in London are undoubtedly dealing with the extent to which the United States should increase her active participation in Palestinian and Middle Eastern Affairs. Zionists are strongly representing to the American government that the prospective settlement in Palestine and the Middle East must not be at the expense of the Jewish National Home.

3. British Association for the Jewish National Home.

What attitude is there at present on the part of the non-Jewish group in Britain corresponding to the Canadian Palestine Committee? Have they recently expressed themselves on the Palestine situation?

Sir Wyndham Deedes is the President of the British Association for the Jewish National Home and, in a recent statement signed by Sir Andrew MacFadyean the Acting-Chairman, the policy of the Briish Government was severely criticized for its failure to execute the mandate and to implement the short range policy recommendations of the Anglo-American Committee re the admission of the 100,000 Jewish victims of Nazi and Fascist persecution to Palestine.